Saturday
27th March, 1954

सत्यमेव जयते

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

HOUSE OF THE PEOPLE

OFFICIAL REPORT

(Part II - Proceedings Other than Questions and Answers)

VOLUME I, 1954

Sixth Session

1954

PARLIAMENT SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

299LSD

Acc. No. 25271
Dated 27.11.2014

THE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(Part II—Proceedings other than Questions and Answers)

OFFICIAL REPORT

HOUSE OF THE PEOPLE

Saturday, 27th March, 1954

The House met at One of the Clock

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

(No Questions. Part I not published.)

1 P.M.

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS—*Contd.*

DEMAND NO. 11—MINISTRY OF DEFENCE

DEMAND NO. 12—DEFENCE SERVICES, EFFECTIVE—ARMY

DEMAND NO. 13—DEFENCE SERVICES, EFFECTIVE—NAVY

DEMAND NO. 14—DEFENCE SERVICES, EFFECTIVE—AIR FORCE

DEMAND NO. 15—DEFENCE SERVICES, NON EFFECTIVE—CHARGES

DEMAND NO. 16—MISCELLANEOUS EXPENDITURE UNDER THE MINISTRY OF DEFENCE

DEMAND NO. 114—DEFENCE CAPITAL OUTLAY

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House will now proceed with the further discussion on the Demands for Grants relating to the Ministry of Defence.

Sardar Hukam Singh (Kapurthala-Bhatinda): We are spending about fifty per cent. of our Budget on defence. I am not one of those who grudge that much of expenditure on defence. What I feel sorry for is that we have not made additional provision for the contingency and the danger that we see ahead. Our Prime Minister the other day scoffed at the idea of our having Home Guards, civil defence organisations, trenches and other air-raid precautions at a time when hydrogen bombs have come into the field. At the same time, he told us that if an attack came we should remain calm and cool. I agree with him there, but could we remain calm and cool if suddenly a hydrogen bomb is dropped and our people are not told about such a contingency? Our Prime Minister thinks that we are not going to entreat our people to get panicky and frightened. Nobody denies that. Rather we want that the people should be entreated not to get panicky and not to get frightened. How is that to be done: that is the real problem. What we complain is that when there is so much of talk on the platform and in the Press and people are being told that there is danger by this Pact between Pakistan and U.S., we cannot assure the masses that the Government is serious and keen enough to make provision for the dangers that might befall our country. That is where we differ from the Government. This Budget for Defence must have reflected something that the Government is earnest and keen and that the people should feel secure that every attempt is being made within the means at our disposal to see that whatever is possible must be done and is being done. The Prime Minister also said that these trenches and air-raid precautions may be necessary to some extent when the danger comes. I fail to understand, when the danger comes, how such precautions could be taken. When there is fire, can we dig a well to get

[Sardar Hukam Singh]

water out of it? It would be too late then. When the bomb comes, can we ask our people to take this precaution? Would that be possible? I fail to understand the logic underlying this theory that when the danger comes, these things would be necessary. But, my idea is that before the danger comes, all these precautions are necessary and we have to take them. When we do not find any provision in the Budget, we feel concerned over it. I am not sorry for the sum that is being spent; I feel more concerned about the way in which the present sum is being spent.

The latest Audit Report that we got was for the year 1953. Reference was made to it by my hon. friend Shri S. S. More yesterday. I too want to make a few observations on the Report that has been given to us. Certainly, when I went into it, I felt surprised how our money was being wasted on account of lack of supervision in several places, not only here in Delhi, but even in London where our Stores Department is. The purchases that have been made reflected lack of foresight, lack of supervision and many other irregularities that we find mentioned in the Report. Rules were not being adhered to, the normal procedure laid down was not being observed. It is a pity that such lapses have happened as are apparent from the Audit Report. If we are to take certain instances so far as these purchases are concerned, let us take the case of tinned milk and milk powder. Large quantities were procured by our High Commissioner in U.K. but tenders were not called for. That procedure was not followed and then competition was restricted. In November 1951, the Ministry of Defence expressed concern at the high price that was being paid and asked for confirmation whether all possible sources had been explored. The High Commissioner pointed out that every possible care had been taken and competitive tenders were called for from all suppliers wherever there was possibility of getting the stores. The letter that was sent from the Defence Ministry also stated that previously we got our stores from Australia. How was it that it was left out?

What we see in the Audit Report is that the usual sources of supply like Australia, Canada, New Zealand, and other countries in Europe also were left out. Tenders were not called even when there was reference from them. Tenders were not invited from those countries and the competition was restricted only to three firms in the Continent. So far as Australia was concerned, one firm had been making supplies at competitive rates, but that was left out altogether without any reasons whatsoever. Then there was New Zealand. From there also we had been receiving our supplies at competitive rates, but one tender was rejected because there was no time for shipment. Therefore it was that further tenders were not invited from them also. The Netherlands Chamber of Commerce sent in the names of two firms that could supply all our demands, and it is curious that a letter was sent to one of them: "You are already supplying some material to India, we do not want to disturb you", without ascertaining whether this firm could make the additional supplies as well, and tenders were not invited from this firm. Then, the Irish authorities informed us that they could supply all that we wanted, and even then tenders were not invited from that country. And in the fourth quarter supplies were ordered simply on one quotation. It is clear that another firm told the High Commissioner that it could make the supply. The firm was asked whether it was possible for it to meet all our supplies by the 20th January and without waiting for their reply, an order was placed on the 16th January on the basis of a single quotation.

What is perhaps more interesting is the case of asbestos cement sheets.

Large indents were placed for this article. As the supplies could not be got from within the country, the orders were cross-mandated to the Director-General, Indian Stores Department, London. It is said that enough publicity was given, but it is curious that only two firms gave tenders.

The Minister of Defence Organisation (Shri Tyagi): May I just take a minute? These matters which pertain to purchases are the concern of my colleague, the Minister for Works, Housing and Supply, and it is very difficult for me to reply as this is being discussed in his absence. I will make a note of it, but I might inform my hon. friend that it is not my concern. I only place indents with the other Ministry.

Shri S. S. More (Sholapur): Should not that Minister be present?

Shri Tyagi: That is just what I wanted to clarify.

Kumari Annie Mascarene (Trivandrum): No. There is collective responsibility.

Sardar Hukam Singh: It was the Defence Ministry that was responsible during this period.

Shri Tyagi: Which period?

Sardar Hukam Singh: 1950-51. The report has come during 1953, but during that period it was the Defence Ministry that was responsible and not the Ministry of Supply.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. I find that various Ministries order for the purchase or supply of various materials. Of course, the agency is the Supply Ministry. For instance, jeeps or aeroplanes. These are all defence material. How can hon. Members know, if they find a defect, whether it is in the indent here or in the processing there or in inspection? Therefore, I expect that the Ministry that purchases or its representative will be here, along with the other Ministry that places the orders. It is only as and when a Ministry is taken up that hon. Members can say that the price paid for a certain thing is too much. When this Ministry is taken up, they are not allowed to have their say. When that Ministry is taken up, that Minister says: "No, that is a special article". In the Budget debate there is only one hon. Minister left alone to take care of himself. There are not even his junior Ministers. This is not the way in which the House or the country should be treated.

Shri S. S. More: As a matter of protest, we shall refuse supplies.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee (Hooghly): How can the Government defend India if they cannot defend their own purchases?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I hope at least the hon. Minister will send word to the hon. Minister of Works, Housing and Supply and someone responsible in that Ministry would be here to answer these matters.

Sardar Hukam Singh: About these asbestos cement sheets, two firms gave their tenders. An order was placed. As soon as the first consignment was received, it was found that there were abnormal breakages. The Director-General was asked how it was that so many had broken. Perhaps, the reason assigned by the Defence Ministry here was that there was this breakage because they were loaded loose. But the reply came at once, saying, no. And the reply that was given is very interesting, *viz.* that it had been found by experience that the asbestos sheets travel more safely when they are loose, but if they are put in crates or cases, they break more, and therefore they thought it necessary to send them loose. This was the reply given. In the next consignment also, breakages were found to a greater extent. So, another letter was addressed to them. Finally, the Defence Ministry had to ask them to stop sending more consignments. But by the time this letter reached them, all the consignments had been brought to India, and therefore nothing could be done. It had been accounted that the percentage of breakages ranged from

[Sardar Hukam Singh]

ten to ninety-two per cent. It is really wonderful that this much of breakage was there. But the more curious thing was when they further dealt with the matter. The sheets that were not broken were sent to the testing department, and they found that all that had been left unbroken, was not according to specification, and therefore useless. So. the whole thing went without any use. This was the story in regard to asbestos sheets.

Ordnance stores were also purchased in May 1951. It happened that one of the officers of the Defence Ministry attended a demonstration of weapons, in the Continent. He found there one gentleman quite all right, and he placed on oral order that he should send more samples to this country. There was no order in writing. The officer came away, and the consignment was despatched from there. After it reached here, a formal order had to be placed. It was found then that the prices were very high. Protests were made afterwards, but the order had to be regularised, by sending a wire from the Defence Ministry. But the money had to be paid at a rate much higher than the market rates. Afterwards, we approached the High Commissioner of that country, and we got ten per cent. reduction for any further orders that we might place. That shows that we paid at least ten per cent. more than we ought to have, simply because an officer of the Ministry, out of whim, I should say, went there and placed an oral order, without finding out whether the man with whom he was placing an order was really a manufacturer or not. He was in fact an agent and not a manufacturer.

Yesterday, Shri S. S. More referred to the purchase of mules. I would also like to refer to that subject, because it is very interesting. The Government of India addressed the Legation of India in Iraq to explore the possibilities of purchasing army mules. The Legation informed us that one firm was prepared to supply the mules. An order for one hundred mules was placed, and the Ministry here was informed. But the Ministry wrote back that our officer would go and inspect the mules and then get the supply. That was also agreed, and an agreement had been entered into with that firm. The officer went there and found that there were no mules at all. He went round and made enquiries and the mules that we wanted were not available in the country. He had to come back and report that there were no mules. We had to pay a heavy sum for the space that we had reserved in the ship as also the expenses of the officer. The last thing was more interesting. We thought we might proceed against the man who had entered into the contract and we went to a lawyer to get his opinion. He said there was no contract at all! So the whole thing was finished. The officer reported that there were no mules and the legal adviser advised that there was no contract. The whole thing was a farce.

Then there was the purchase of butter. A good sum of about Rs. 16,000 was spent, but it was found on opening that it was useless and unfit for consumption. An order was made that it should be converted into *ghee*.

Then there was the question of fuel. Normally, we used to get firewood at the rate of Rs. 1/7/- per maund. The man who usually used to supply was not asked to give his quotations. Another man was asked. There were about 28 contractors on the list and only seven or eight of them were asked to put in their tenders. One was selected. Order was placed, in the first instance, at Rs. 1/4/- per maund, then at Rs. 2/3/- and ultimately, because winter had set in, the supply was taken at Rs. 2/14/- a maund. The queer thing was that when the winter was over, it was found that the whole thing was surplus; the firewood that was purchased

at an exorbitant price was never wanted and they had to consume it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Was it also through the Supply Department?

Sardar Hukam Singh: Yes, Sir.

Then it was found that it was surplus and they had to use it during summer, when it could be got very cheap. These stores purchases and ordnance depots are stories where we will find that huge sums have been wasted and we have had no supervision over them.

So far as the stores lying in depots are concerned, that too is a woeful story. The present tonnage of stores is about 1·6 lakh tons. We have got accommodation for only 0·2 lakh tons. All the rest are exposed to sun and rain. In the last packages that have been opened now, it has been found that there is shortage. The verification had not been enforced for the last seven years—now it has been completed. Loss of several lakhs has been discovered and whatever is left is left to the inclemency of the weather. Every year we are losing huge sums in that respect. My submission is that if what we are spending is spent with care, large amounts of money can be got out of that, which can be more usefully applied to our defence that is needed most at this hour but which is being neglected. That is our complaint.

Shri Barman (North Bengal—Reserved—Sch. Castes): Sir, first of all I beg to submit that this defence expenditure is almost 50 per cent. of our revenue. In addition to that, it is such a department which is 'confidential' in most of its functions and we, in this House, also think that it is quite proper for us also not to pry into the secrets which the Defence Ministry wants to keep. That is all the more reason why more time should be devoted to the discussion over defence expenditure; so that each and every Member who might raise any point regarding such expenditure or other matters might have ample time. It is all the more necessary for the hon. Minister, especially because his department is almost a closed subject, to devote more time to look into the inner working of this department.

While I look into the working of our Defence department, I want to look at it particularly from two points of view. We know that warfare in the modern world has become so complex and so intricate that for the Government of India it is beyond their means and beyond circumstances to be equipped with weapons of modern warfare. Especially with the invention of the atom bomb and the hydrogen bomb, we are nowhere when we contrast our position with countries like U.S.S.R. and U.S.A. That is one part of it. So far as the other part is concerned, certainly I think that the Defence Ministry is doing whatever is possible with the money and supplies under the circumstances in which we are placed, and in fact, they are doing to the best of their ability. I simply want to mention a few words about the atomic warfare about which the hon. Prime Minister spoke the other day while the House was discussing the External Affairs budget. He has plainly told us that if there is a warfare with the use of hydrogen and atom bombs, then,—so far as India is concerned, we are nowhere; half the world may be devastated. It reminds me of the words of another important personage of the western part of this hemisphere,—that is, Mr. Anthony Eden. While the Commonwealth Conference was discussing defence matters, he told a story. I wish to repeat it here. It expresses the same view. In the case of a future war, when the last atom bomb was dropped upon our poor earth, everything was laid desolate everywhere; and there was nothing but a heap of ruins. Then, after some time, from one heap of ruins, climbed one little monkey and went up to the top of a tree. Some time after, another little monkey came out of another heap and went up to the same tree and both of them were

[Shri Barman]

looking round, but there was nothing but desolation. The gentleman monkey however turned around and gave a gentle stroke on the cheek of the lady monkey; but the lady monkey replied, "No dear, I do not think we should start this all over again". Why I mention this tale here is that so far as Asia, and I think Africa also, are concerned, these two great personages, whose opinions count in the eastern and western parts of this hemisphere, have expressed their views about the horrors of the next world war. But, of course, there are two other nations—U.S.S.R. on the one hand, and U.S.A. on the other—who, out of mutual distrust, or whatever might be the cause, are fast preparing for the next world war. There will be some conflagration somewhere, and the whole world will be engulfed in a great war. In this predicament, what can India do? I consider—India has a great part to play in view of its strategic position. The two countries—U.S.S.R. and U.S.A.—are so placed, that unless India, with the Far East, Middle East and South-East Asia, joins either side, there cannot be any decisive war. At least we can try to avert the war by proclaiming our neutrality and by mutual agreement amongst ourselves. Whichever country out of these two be the first aggressor, we should take action against it and I think—that may go a long way in averting the next world war. That is where the importance of India lies. We are sorry that U.S.A. has entered into a military assistance pact—I do not know the exact nature of that pact—which disturbs the equilibrium,—because it will scare U.S.S.R. and perhaps, out of self-defence, the third world war will start. The American President has assured our Prime Minister that if Pakistan were to attempt to use American aid for any aggressive designs, he will take all measures in his power to thwart it. Of course, we take him at his word. But at the same time I would like to remind him of what our Prime Minister has said. Let him, in the first instance, prove his *bona fides* by declaring Pakistan an aggressor so far as Kashmir is concerned. So long as American attitude continues to be what it is on this question, we are not in a position to place full trust in regard to their future actions. Let him, by action prove what he means.

Let me be permitted to say a few words about our Defence Forces. When Sir Archibald Nye, who was British High Commissioner here, was addressing Members of Parliament in one of the Inter-Parliamentary Group meetings he was asked his opinion about introduction of prohibition among the Defence Forces. His categorical reply was that prohibition will not in any way affect the efficiency of the army and that there is no necessity for drink in the army. This was of course his personal view. I do not for a moment mean to say that the hon. Minister should at once stop all use of liquor in our army. But I should suggest to him that if he can gradually, step by step, manage to make our army conform to the standards of tee-totaller, save when it is necessary for medical purposes or remove dreariness on unforeseen occasions, it would be a matter to be welcomed by India which has adopted prohibition as one of her objectives. I am sure the hon. Minister will try as much as is in his power in this regard.

In regard to internal defence, I would like to bring one important fact to the Defence Minister's notice. This is in regard to our North-Eastern Frontier. I may in this connection bring to his notice an experience of ours in 1941-42, I mean the second world war. The Japanese Army was advancing towards India. Calcutta was the main supply base on our side. There were four broad gauge lines to

move materials to the eastern frontier. I know it for a fact—because I know something of the talks in the Cabinet—that if we had better lines of communication, the Bengal famine could perhaps have been averted, or at least its ravages mitigated to some extent. We had rice in Orissa selling at Rs. 7 per maund. But it could not be moved to Calcutta and within two weeks the price of rice in Calcutta shot up from Rs. 7 to Rs. 15 and the calamity started. I mention this to impress on the Government the importance of the lines of communication in this part of India. There is only one metre gauge line and that too is very weak and feeble. In an emergency it will not be in a position to cope with civilian as well as military needs. It is high time, in view of the circumstances in this country as well as in the world, we paid a little more attention to this vital line of communication, so that we may not be absolutely stranded in an emergency.

श्री भक्त दर्शन (जिला गढ़वाल—पूर्व व जिला मुरादाबाद उत्तर पूर्व) : सभापति जी, प्रति रक्षा मंत्रालय के अनुदानों के सम्बन्ध में होने वाले इस वाद विवाद में भाग लेने का साहस मुझे इसलिये हो रहा है कि पहले तो मेरा निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र तिब्बत की सीमा से मिलता है और दूसरे जिस निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र का मैं प्रतिनिधित्व करता हूं, इसमें कोई अतिशयोक्ति की बात नहीं कि उस क्षेत्र ने भारतीय सेना में बहुत बड़ी संख्या में सैनिक दिये हैं। इस बात का प्रमाण इस तथ्य से भी मिलता है कि नई सहायक प्रादेशिक सेना की योजना के अन्तर्गत जो कैम्प्स आज इस देश के कोने कोने में संगठित किये जा रहे हैं, उन में से एक कैम्प आजकल लैन्सडौन में हो रहा है। इन कैम्पों के लिये अधिकतम संख्या ४८० की निर्धारित की गई है और मुझे वहां जा कर के बड़ी प्रसन्नता हुई कि उस कैम्प के लिये जो कोटा निश्चित किया गया था, वह ही पूरा नहीं हुआ, बल्कि लगभग सौ नवयुवक बहुत दूर से चल कर आये, लेकिन उनको निराश हो कर जाना पड़ा। मुझे पता नहीं है कि देश के अन्य भागों में भी इस नयी योजना के लिये इतना सहयोग मिल रहा है या नहीं।

सभापति जी, पिछले वर्ष इसी अनुदान के सम्बन्ध में बोलते हुए मैं ने अपने प्रतिरक्षा-संगठन के मंत्री महोदय को बधाई देते हुए यह आशा प्रकट की थी कि वे अपने नाम को सार्थक करेंगे, अर्थात् अपने 'त्यागी' नाम के अनुसार वे प्रतिरक्षा के बजट में से एक काफी बड़ी रकम की बचत करके उसे विकास कार्यों में खर्च करने के लिये देंगे, लेकिन मैं देखता हूं कि इस वर्ष जो पुराना अनुदान था उसमें ६ करोड़ की वृद्धि और की गई है। जब देश की संकटपूर्ण परिस्थिति का हम अध्ययन करते हैं तो मैं समझता हूं कि यह ६ करोड़ की रकम कुछ अधिक नहीं और इस बारे में मैं समझता हूं कि सदन के माननीय सदस्य मुझ से सहमत होंगे कि त्यागी जी ने जिस धन राशि की मांग की है, उसमें किसी तरह की कटौती नहीं करनी चाहिये।

दूसरे उन के नाम में जो 'महावीर' शब्द आता है, तो मैं ने यह आशा प्रकट की थी कि भारत की सेना जो पहले से ही "वीर" रही है, वे उसे अपने कार्यकाल के अन्दर "महावीर" सिद्ध करेंगे। इस एक वर्ष के उन के कार्यकाल में हमारे देश के अन्दर ही नहीं बल्कि सुदूर पूर्व कोरिया में भी हमारे सैनिकों ने जो ऐतिहासिक आदर्श उपस्थित किया है, मैं समझता हूं कि उन के द्वारा हमने संसार के इतिहास में एक नये पृष्ठ को अंकित किया है। कोरिया में हमारे अफसरों और सैनिकों ने जो शानदार परम्परा कायम की है, उसके लिये हमने उनकी प्रशंसा में बहुत गीत गाये हैं और कोरिया से लौटे हुए अपने जवानों का मद्रास हारबर में स्वागत

[श्री भक्त दर्शन]

किया है, तथा देहली रेलवे स्टेशन पर उनको हार पहनाये गये हैं, और ये हमारे फौजी भाई इस स्वागत के सर्वथा योग्य थे क्योंकि कोरिया में सफलता के साथ उन्होंने अपने कठिन कर्त्तव्य को निभाया। कोरिया में, अगर मुझे ठीक याद है तो, जहां बर्फ जमी हुई थी और टैम्परेचर उससे भी ३६ डिगरी नीचे था तथा अति भयंकर ठंड थी—ऐसे मौसम में ६ महीने तक उन्हें लगातार कार्य करना पड़ा, आज वे भारत लौट कर झांसी या और दूसरे अन्य गरम कैन्टूनमेंट्स में समय बिता रहे हैं। मैं इस सम्बन्ध में यह नम्र सुझाव देना चाहता हूं कि उन को लैंसडौन आदि पहाड़ी छावनियों में विश्राम करने का अवसर दिया जाय, पहाड़ों की छावनियां खाली पड़ी हुई हैं, हम उन लोगों को वहां भेज कर एक प्रकार से पुरस्कृत कर सकेंगे और साथ ही हम उन पहाड़ी छावनियों की सुध भी ले सकेंगे।

सभापति महोदय, पिछले वर्ष भी मैं ने अपने प्रतिरक्षा-मंत्री महोदय का ध्यान तिब्बत की ओर दिलाया था और मुझे इस बात की प्रसन्नता है कि भारत सरकार का बहुत कुछ ध्यान अब इस समस्या की ओर गया है और उसके परिणामस्वरूप कई जगह पर चेक पोस्ट्स बढ़ाये गये हैं और विशेष सशस्त्र पुलिस (स्पेशल आर्म्ड कान्स्टेबलरी) को भी स्थान स्थान पर नियुक्त किया गया है। मेरा अनुमान है कि इस पुलिस की नियुक्ति के बाद से उन इलाकों में जो एक भय छाया हुआ था उसमें कमी आई है और लोगों में विश्वास का उदय हुआ है। पिछले वर्ष भारत सरकार के कोष से, जहां तक मुझे मालूम है, करीब बाईस लाख, पचास हजार रुपये उत्तर प्रदेश, हिमाचल प्रदेश, और पंजाब की सरकारों को दिये गये थे ताकि वहां पर वे पुलिस का समुचित प्रबन्ध कर सकें; मुझे आशा ही नहीं विश्वास भी है कि भारत सरकार इस नीति को आगे भी जारी रखेगी।

लेकिन मुझे यह भी कहना पड़ता है कि इस सम्बन्ध में अभी तक भारत सरकार की नीति कुछ ढुलमुल सी है। सभापति जी, आपको याद होगा कि आज से कुछ ही दिन पहले इस सदन में एक प्रश्न कर्ता के उत्तर में वैदेशिक विभाग के उपमंत्री महोदय ने यह बताया था कि लद्दाख के नजदीक तिब्बत में चीन की सेनायें हवाई अड्डा बना रही हैं, इस बात की जानकारी उन्हें नहीं है। उसी समय मैं ने इस आशय का एक पूरक प्रश्न पूछा था कि क्या मानसरोवर के पास भी एक हवाई अड्डा बनने की सूचना भारत सरकार को है? उसका उत्तर भी नकारात्मक दिया गया था। जहां तक मैं समझता हूं इस के दो ही कारण हो सकते हैं। या तो भारत सरकार को वास्तव में इन बातों की जानकारी नहीं है; यदि ऐसा है तो मुझे खेद है कि हमारी भारत सरकार की मशीनरी इतनी कमजोर और शिथिल है कि वह इतनी भारी बातों का भी पता नहीं लगा सकती। इसका दूसरा कारण यह हो सकता है कि जान-बूझ कर इन बातों को छिपाया जाता है। यदि ऐसा है तो मैं बड़े विनम्र ढंग से यह सुझाव देना चाहता हूं कि यद्यपि मैं उन व्यक्तियों में से हूं जो कि भारत और चीन की परम मैत्री के प्रशंसक और समर्थक हैं, लेकिन हमारी मित्रता बालू की दीवार नहीं होनी चाहिये कि जरा से धक्के से गिर जाय। एक दूसरे के तथ्यों को प्रकट करने से मैं यह आवश्यक नहीं समझता कि हमारे बीच की मित्रत समाप्त हो जायेगी। मैं आशा करता हूं कि भारत-सरकार और प्रतिरक्षा-मंत्रालय अपनी वर्तमान ढिलमिल नीति को समाप्त करके इस के बारे में अवश्य ही कोई तगड़ी और निश्चित नीति को अपनायेंगे।

सभापति जी, पिछले वर्ष जो वार्षिक विवरण हमें मिला था, उसे पढ़ कर मुझे प्रसन्नता हुई थी कि उसमें "स्नो ऐंड माउन्टेन वारफेयर" की ट्रेनिंग देने का जिक्र किया गया था, अर्थात् बर्फानी और पर्वतीय इलाकों के युद्ध की शिक्षा के लिये। लेकिन मुझे खेद है कि इस वर्ष की विवरण पत्रिका में इसका उल्लेख नहीं है। इसका कोई कारण मेरी समझ में नहीं आता। मैं समझता हूं कि इसके लिये कुछ नहीं किया जा रहा है। मंत्रालय की ओर से यह तर्क उपस्थित किया जा सकता है कि पिछले महा युद्ध के समय जिस तरह बर्मा में जा कर हमारी सेनाओं ने "जंगल-वारफेयर" की एक विशेष ट्रेनिंग प्राप्त कर ली थी, और जिस तरह उत्तरी अफरीका के युद्ध में उन्होंने रेगिस्तानी युद्ध के ढंग को सीखा था, उसी तरह कश्मीर के पिछले युद्ध के अन्दर हमारी सेनाओं ने "माउन्टेन ऐंड स्नो वारफेयर' की ट्रेनिंग भी पा ली है। लेकिन मुझे मंत्री महोदय क्षमा करेंगे ; मेरे पास ऐसे उदाहरण हैं कि कुछ मौकों पर हमारे सिपाहियों को कुछ नाजुक बदन नौजवान अफसरों को अपने कंधों पर ले जाना पड़ा था, क्योंकि वह लोग वहां की ठंड को बर्दाश्त नहीं कर पाये। इसलिये इस बात की आवश्यकता है कि हम इस दिशा में भी अफसरों व सैनिकों को ट्रेनिंग दें।

इस सम्बन्ध में मैं मंत्रालय को खास तौर पर बधाइ और धन्यवाद देना चाहता हूं कि उन्होंने एक 'इन्स्टीट्यूट औफ माउन्टेनियरिंग' (पर्वतारोहण की संस्था) प्रारम्भ की है। हिमव्याघ्र शेरपा सरदार तेनसिंह के नाम से आज भारत का बच्चा बच्चा परिचित है ; उन्हीं के संचालन में सम्भवतया दार्जीलिंग में इस संस्था की स्थापना की गई है। इस कार्य के लिये मैं सरकार को बहुत-बहुत बधाई देता हूं और मेरी आशा तथा विश्वास है कि इस इन्स्टीट्यूट के द्वारा हमारे अफसरों को ही नहीं बल्कि दूसरे नौजवानों को भी पर्वतारोहण की शिक्षा दी जायेगी।

मैं अपना यह कर्त्तव्य भी समझता हूं कि अब भारत के जो नवयुवक ऊंचे पर्वतारोहण के कार्य में कदम बढ़ाने लगे हैं उनको भी बधाई दूं। सदन को मालूम होगा कि पिछले एक वर्ष के समय में हमारे दो भारतीय अभियान-दलों ने पर्वतारोहण के कार्य में अपूर्व सफलता प्राप्त की है। एक दल मेजर नरेन्द्र धर जुयाल के नेतृत्व में 'ऐबिगेमिन' चोटी पर गया और दूसरा दल श्री प्राणनाथ निकोर के संचालन में "पंचचुली" शिखर पर गया और उन पर विजय प्राप्त की। यह इस बात को सिद्ध करता है कि हमारे नौजवानों के अन्दर भी साहिसकता की प्रवृत्ति बढ़ती जा रही है। मैं आशा करता हूं कि हमारी भारत-सरकार ऐसे कामों के लिये जो हमारी नवयुवकों की संस्थायें हैं, जैसे 'हिमालयन सोसाइटी' और "माउन्टेनियरिंग इन्स्टिट्यूट," इन को पूरी तरह से सहायता देगी।

इस वार्षिक रिपोर्ट में यह भी उल्लेख किया गया है कि आजाद हिन्द फौज के सैनिकों को, जिनको तमगे वगैरह मिले थे, उन के भत्तों को फिर से जारी किया जा रहा है ; और यह १५ अगस्त, १९४७ से दिये जायेंगे। मैं इसके लिये अपने मंत्री जी को धन्यवाद और बधाई देना चाहता हूं, लेकिन साथ में मैं इतना कह देना चाहता हूं कि इससे उनको पूरा संतोष नहीं है। आजाद हिन्द फौज के सैनिकों के जो भत्ते जब्त किये गये थे, उनकी जो पेन्शनें जब्त की गई थीं, इसी तरह उन के एकाउन्ट्स जो शेष हैं वे अभी तक उनको नहीं मिले हैं। मैं ने इस वर्ष के विवरण में देखा कि हमारी गवर्नमेंट की नीति है कि "To treat the ex-I.N.A. personnel as generously as possible." अर्थात् आजाद हिन्द फौज के भूतपूर्व सैनिकों के साथ यथासंभव उदारता का व्यवहार

[श्री भक्त दर्शन]

किया जाय। तो मेरा ख्याल है कि मंत्री जी में जो उदारता और विशालता है उसको वे और गवर्नमेंट ज्यादा विस्तृत करेंगे और उनके जो एकाउन्ट्स इस बीच में अब्त हुये हैं उन को देने की कृपा करेंगे।

इसी सिलसिले में मैं अपना यह भी कर्तव्य समझता हूं कि आज से २४ वर्ष पहले पेशावर के प्रसिद्ध कांड में जिन गढ़वाली सैनिकों ने भारतीय सैनिकों के सामने राष्ट्रीयता का आदर्श रखा था उसको भी न भुलाया जाय। जहां तक मुझे मालूम है उनको यद्यपि पेन्शन दी जा चुकी है, लेकिन जो उनकी "डेफर्ड पे" व "बैलेन्स ऐकाउन्ट्स हैं व उन्हें नहीं दिये गये हैं मुझे ठीक मालूम नहीं कि वह कितना है, लेकिन वह बहुत बड़ी रकम नहीं है, उसे उनको दिया जाय। जिन हमारे सैनकों ने सबसे पहले राष्ट्रीयता की चिनगारी को प्रज्वलित किया था, मैं आशा करता हूं कि हमारे माननोय मंत्री महोदय, जो कि अपनी उदारता के लिये प्रसिद्ध हैं और जोकि हमारी फौज के सैनिक और कमांडर रह चुके हैं, वे इस ओर ध्यान देंगे। मुझे ठीक रकम नहीं मालूम, लेकिन यह अधिक से अधिक १२-१४ हज़ार रुपये की रकम है, आशा है कि वे उसके बारे में बहुत सख्ती नहीं बरतेंगे। और मेरी प्रार्थना को स्वीकार करने की कृपा करेंगे।

एक बात मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूं कि हमारे देश के लाखों परिवार पेन्शनें और दूसरे ऐलाउन्सेज लेते हैं और उसी पर निर्भर करते हैं। अकेले मेरे गढ़वाल प्रदेश में लगभग एक लाख व्यक्ति इस श्रेणी में आते हैं। लेकिन आज उन भूतपूर्व सैनिकों में बड़ा असंतोष है। इस के दो मुख्य कारण हैं। एक तो यह कि लड़ाई के जमाने में उन सैनिकों की तनख्वाहों में से एक-एक और दो-दो रुपये काट कर 'एक्स-सर्विसमेनस पोस्ट-वार रिकन्सट्रक्शन फंड' (भूतपूर्व सैनिक युद्धोत्तर पुनर्निर्माण कोष) बनाया गया था। इसके सम्बन्ध में उनके साथ पूरा न्याय नहीं किया जा रहा है। मैं अपने महामान्य राज्य पालों और राजप्रमुखों की आलोचना नहीं करना चाहता लेकिन यह रकम, जहां तक मुझे मालूम है, उनके एकाधिकार में दे दी गई है और इसका परिणाम यह निकला है कि यहां संसद् में और राज्यों की धारा सभाओं में हमारे विधान सभा के लोग उस पर आलोचना नहीं कर सकते। मैं मंत्री महोदय से यह प्रार्थना करूंगा कि वे इस बारे में कोई ऐसा तरीका निकालें जिससे इस रकम का अच्छे से अच्छा उपयोग शीघ्रता से हो सके।

अन्त में एक ही बात मुझे और कहनी है। रिज़र्व में जो सैनिक भेजे जाते हैं, यानी पांच सात साल की नौकरी के बाद जिन लोगों को रिज़र्व में भेजा जाता है और उनको ३ रु० रिज़र्व अलाउन्स दिया जाता है। इससे उन को क्या संतोष होता है? उन लोगों के अन्दर वास्तव में बड़ा असंतोष है। मैं चाहता हूं कि जैसे मंत्री महोदय और सब बातों की ओर बड़ी उदारता से विचार करते हैं तथा नये पेंशन कोड के द्वारा उन्होंने पेन्शनें बढ़ा दी हैं, उसी तरह रिज़र्व सैनिकों के बारे में भी वे उदारता पूर्वक विचार करेंगे। सरकार उनको बांधना चाहती है, बहुत काम उन्होंने किया है, और जब भी देश की पुकार होती है तब वह चले आते हैं, लेकिन उनको दिया क्या जाता है? तीन रु० या पांच रु० मासिक यह उनके प्रति न्याय नहीं है।

मैं आशा करता हूं कि मंत्री महोदय मेरे इन सुझावों पर विचार करेंगे और इनको स्वीकार करने की कृपा करेंगे।

Shri Shankargauda Patil (Belgaum South): I thank you for the opportunity given to me to speak. To

defend, in these days of modern warfare, has become a very complicated business. Therefore, to draw up the defence strategy, one will have to take into consideration so many factors namely the economic front, ideological front and the external front. We must bear in mind that modern wars are necessarily wars of the people, wars with ordinary people. As in the olden days, wars are nowadays not fought by a few mercenaries or a few people ruling over the heads of the many. Therefore, the psychology of an ordinary man or woman in the country is as important as the weapons that a soldier bears. Therefore, before formulating the defence policy, we must have to take into consideration the psychology or ambition of the ordinary people in the country. It is not necessary that our country should become a first-rate military power. Our main ambition is and our people want that Government should fight a battle against poverty and disease. That is why the country has sent the Congress Government and that Government is in power. If this point is neglected, there will be political instability and subversion in the country. And that is why, our Government, with this intention of satisfying the aspirations of our people, have formulated a Five Year Plan and the Five Year Plan has been worked for the first three years. The short-term targets of the Five Year Plan were to have increased agricultural production and raw materials. Those objectives have been fairly achieved, and now the Government has set about the important aspect of strengthening and consolidating our economy. That is why the Plan has been revised, re-shaped and revitalised, and the employment opportunities have to be widened by the Government. It is a very important step so far as our economic development is concerned. That is why, the Government has kept a proper balance between the military and civil expenditure in the Budget. And that is why, the Government's policy, so far as defence is concerned, from the economic point of view, is justifiable.

It is often said by so many hon. Members that foreign countries have got very many dangerous weapons, that they are going ahead with war preparations, and therefore, they ask, how can we meet a threat of war if a war comes? That is why so many proposals are put forward like making an alliance with Russia, or receiving military aid from some other country. Hearing all these suggestions, my mind recalls the picture of a passenger travelling in a moving railway coach standing while his fellow-travellers were sitting, obviously under the wrong impression or false illusion, that he would reach the destination much ahead than others. Therefore, we have to move slowly and our pace in this direction of armaments and all other things is limited by so many considerations, and that is what our Government is doing.

I have heard with attention the explanation given in this respect. So far as our defence, armaments production and equipment are concerned, the Prime Minister has made the position clear, and after hearing the Prime Minister, nobody should take any objection or suspect the earnestness of our Government in this respect. That is one thing.

Secondly, in these modern wars, the ideological front is also very important. We see that the battle of ideologies or the conflict of ideologies incessantly going on as preparation for or background or prelude to war. Therefore, we see in the world there are two groups now, U.S.S.R. and America, or we may call them the capitalistic bloc and the Soviet bloc. They have got different ideologies, their approach to peace is through strength. That is why each side is making alliances, acquiring bases, territories and all these things, and they are manufacturing big armaments. Propaganda is carried on by

[Shri Shankargauda Patil]

both countries to see that more people are attracted to their side or their ideology. Therefore, our country must also have an ideological front. We must have a definite ideology. That is why, our country's approach is peace through love and co-operation, and external disputes are to be resolved through non-violent and non-military methods. This is our particular ideology, and we must realise that unless our people believe in our ideology, unless they have faith in the economic programmes put forward by our Government, we cannot have the people with us. That is why we must see that our ideology is made popular, and that our people believe in our foreign policy and economic programmes. Therefore, if we want that a threat of war should be thwarted or that our people should be ready to meet aggression, we must see that the ideology, the foreign policy and the economic programmes of our Government are not criticised just for the sake of partisanship, as this would be undermining the confidence of our people in our ideology, and that means that we would be lessening the political stability and breeding internal subversion.

Thirdly, there is the external front. Supposing there is a threat of war or aggression, as we see now on account of the recent U.S.A.-Pakistan military aid pact, how are we to meet it? We know how costly the weapons of modern warfare are. Even if all our manpower and other resources are squandered in the manufacturing of these weapons, I do not think that within a measurable distance of time, we can become a first-class military power. So, we have to exhaust all peaceful and non-military methods to fight aggression, before we resort to fight a war in a military way. This is what our Government are doing.

Supposing a war comes, how will our Army meet it? The Army has got some valuable qualities of its own, which can be summed up in a short phrase 'CDLE'—the letter C standing for contentment, D for discipline, L for loyalty, and E for efficiency. These are the four intrinsic qualities necessary for an army, either to prevent a war or to fight a war. These values of our Army have been displayed more than once on former occasions, and our Army is as good as any other modern army in the world, so far as this point is concerned.

I would like to make certain suggestions as to how we should meet war or the threat of war. We have first to take into consideration the student world also. We have been seeing of late so many disturbances in the student world, and so many destructive tendencies. The valuable qualities of our students, *viz.* discipline, patriotism, etc. which were exhibited by them in the pre-independence days, have now disappeared, so to say, and a crisis of character has overcome our students. If we are to defend the country, we must have political stability as well as internal peace. For this purpose, we must see that the enthusiasm and energy of our students are directed and canalised into some fruitful channels.

Therefore, I suggest that the sphere of the National Cadet Corps must be widened, so as to take our college students into its fold. However, our Government do not seem to be in favour of this, on the ground that the hurdle of finance is there. But we can devise some simple and less costly methods to suit a poor country like ours, and see that at least part-time military training is given to our students. It is an inevitable thing that we have to do.

There is one other thing where we can economise. We are still following the ceremonious methods of the British days. Every person taking military training must have a khaki uniform and soldiers' boots. Supposing a war comes, and there is a bombing of our textile mills and shoe factories, are we going to ask our Army

to retreat, because there are no khaki uniforms, or soldiers' boots? We are not going to do that, and the inevitable things will go on with whatever material we have got. Taking this psychology into consideration, we must give at least part-time military training to our students, and see that they become part-time soldiers. If that is done, our students will be really useful as bricks in our defence line when an emergency comes. By this, we can achieve two objects; first, we can wean away the students from destructive activities, and secondly, we shall have them as important defence meterial, if a war comes. From these two points of view, our students—or at least some of them—must be taken into the National Cadet Corps, and given military training.

Shri Jethalal Joshi (Madhya Saurashtra): I support the motion for the Demands for Grants placed before the House. Looking into the Defence budget, we find that the estimate stands at Rs. 205 crores. I must congratulate the hon. Minister, because he has shown himself absolutely unruffled by those storms that are gathering outside. At the outset, let me remind the House that the First World War terminated in 1918, and it threw Russia into the arms of communism. Then the Second World War was started; it lasted four years and at the end of that China emerged as a mighty communist nation.

2 P.M.

Now, there are two big question marks before the world. The first is, who is going to take the responsibility of starting the third world war or who is going to ride the mad war-horse. The second is, which nation, at the end of that third world war, is going to be flung into the camp of communism. These are two big questions before us. We shall have to answer these questions.

We know that after so many loud denials, at last there has been a military alliance between Pakistan and U.S.A. This is not a trade pact, nor a cultural alliance and there is nothing ideologically common between them. This is simply a military alliance and what is the object of it? The correspondent of the *New York Times*, in the early days of November, 1953, had written that the object of this is that Pakistan wants to strengthen itself and its forces with a view to facilitate the problem or issue of Kashmir. Pakistan has no love for democracy; for this, let's go and ask the Ahmadia people what has happened to them. It has no hatred of communism because we know that the leaders of Pakistan had been to Russia so many times. But, it has only hostility to India as its ruling motive. Therefore, I am sure that Pakistan has in its mind the object of invading India. What should we do? What is the remedy? The answer lies in the stout minds and the strong heads of 36 crores of our Indian people. We must answer it with all the might at our command. We have heard here something about the horrors of war and the type of world war it would be, if it comes. I have got something to say about the horrors of war. Let me quote. "The U.S.A. may have hydrogen weapons more potent than the experimental one which tore a crater a mile wide and 175 feet deep in the Pacific Ocean floor in 1952". Mr. Cole, the Chairman of the Joint Congressional Atomic Energy Committee, said that "The thermo-nuclear test of 1952 completely obliterated the test island in the Enivetak Atoll". He further added: "The U.S.A. had in being an entire family of atomic weapons, some of them 25 (but now 600)* times more powerful than the bomb that wrecked the Japanese city of Hiroshima in the closing stages of the last world war". On hearing this, even the people of the United Kingdom and Japan are terrified by such a destructive power of atomic energy. We know that Europe has had enough of the bad experiences and bad fruits of the world wars. The First and the Second World Wars were fought on the plains of France, Germany and other countries and they have seen that their

[Shri Jethalal Joshi]

houses have been demolished, their factories have been shattered and human lives have been lost in lakhs. They want to transfer the theatre of war. Where could they transfer it? They want to transfer it somewhere in Asia. The curtains are the same, the actors are the same and the materials are the same, but they want to see that the scene is changed and, therefore, they want some place to put their foot on. Pakistan has been a good scape-goat that way and now they have entered into a mutual alliance with Pakistan. The aid is stated to be mutual. What is the meaning of 'mutual aid'? The U.S.A. has to give something, in terms of materials and money, and Pakistan also has to give something, that is, the bases and the plains of Pakistan, and so it is mutual! There can be nothing without any consideration and this is the consideration on the part of Pakistan. Some of the people of Pakistan have realised this and, therefore, they are also trying to oppose it as far as possible.

Suppose we are not involved in a war. Then also we have to do something. Suppose we remain neutral and the scene of the war is a thousand miles away. Still we must build our armament economy and we must produce our armament materials so as to be self-reliant and as little dependent on others as possible. If a war breaks out between some countries, though we are not involved in it, even then the warring countries would like to have as many of the neutral countries on their side and in their camp as possible. What shall we do then? We have to import certain materials for our civilian purposes and for our military purposes. The warring countries will stop all sorts of trade with us and will make their economic blockade as rigid as possible, and if that economic blockade is made rigid, we will be starved of our imports. Therefore we must be self-reliant as far as possible. I may in this connection read a passage from *War and Defence Economics*. We have manganese in our country but we do not utilise it for our military purposes. Referring to America this book says:

> "Although we have barely more than a fifteenth of the world's surface and a bit less of the world's population, we consume, even in peacetime, a far higher proportion of the world's output of raw materials. We rely heavily upon foreign sources of supply for many items such as copper, lead, manganese, etc."

We export large quantities of manganese to America. Those countries require manganese for the production of finished materials and import it from us, whereas we who have manganese in large quantities do not utilise it at all.

Then again, out of 23 minerals and metals considered essential in war, India has only 13. India will be hard hit in war for lack of these strategic materials, especially petroleum and petroleum products. The only remedy is production of substitutes for civilian use and stockpiling of other materials, so that the resulting surpluses may cover the deficit in regard to the aforesaid essential minerals and raw materials in short supply.

Shri Tyagi: Sir, I must very gratefully acknowledge that the House has been very very magnanimous in their expressions or in their comments with regard to the Armed Forces of India. If at all there has come any criticism from any side of the House, the criticism has been to the effect that the Armed Forces were not being looked after very well, or that further improvement could be effected. These are healthy criticisms. Such criticisms are always welcome to a Minister. So I do welcome those criticisms and thank my hon. friends who have taken pains to go into various documents to bring them before the House and through the House before the nation.

Sir, this is an occasion when a Minister should be in a position to make some announcement of policy. As you know, Sir, there is no independent policy in defence. In fact, defence comes in only when Diplomacy has explored all means and there is no other course left: then defence comes in. Just as a soldier has no political policy, the Defence Ministry, I believe, has no political policy. If I had a political policy, then I would not enjoy that pleasure, which I do, at the fact that the whole country, including parties holding all types of ideologies stand united with us in regard to defence.

[PANDIT THAKUR DAS BHARGAVA *in the Chair*]

It is so because all the policies combine together when the question of defence comes. The Defence Ministry's policy is the policy of keeping the defence always in readiness. That is the only policy, and I can only speak on that matter and not on others.

The Prime Minister has made it very clear how we are managing our defence and on what basis our whole defence structure is put up. As I have already said, I do not intend to add anything to a matter which is a subject of high policy. It is very clear to everybody in the world that India and India's Forces have no aggressive designs. All countries of the world are friendly to us. That is what our Constitution bids us. Namely, that we must make friends with the whole world. We have no enemies. We start with that basis. Some of my friends seem to have construed that the Prime Minister meant that we should sit silent and should make no arrangements for our defence. That was not his meaning. The meaning is that we remain strictly neutral. And I submit that neutrality is the biggest weapon of defence in the world today. If the neutrality of a country is violated by another, there are powers who care to see that the aggressor is resisted by others, not only by the country whose neutrality has been violated against. That has been the historical privilege of a neutral nation. No one party can attack a neutral nation because there are the other parties to protect it.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh (Shahabad South): What happened in Kashmir?

Shri Tyagi: I will come to Kashmir too.

I therefore submit that neutrality may not be taken to be an ordinary force, it is a force which has much potentiality about it. Lines of defence that are constructed in other countries, like the Maginot Line, are not so strong and so complete as the imaginary 'Maginot' defence line of neutrality. And therefore our leader depends upon that line of defence to start with.

But then, immediately after that line, comes the question of defence arrangements, because neutrality does not make it psysically impossible for anybody to break through. One might violate it. As soon as neutrality is violated, the whole thing changes. The shape of fronts changes and the present strategy, whatever it be, may not hold good. Immediately, the whole phase of warfare will be changed.

But even so, a neutral nation must always keep in readiness. I may assure the House, without going into many details, that for the last six years the Armed Forces of India have kept constantly in readiness. And I might assure you that even today our Armed Forces do not require any very long notice—not even that much notice which is required for a short notice question. So the country is in readiness. It is from this point of view....

Sardar Hukam Singh: But Ministers are not ready!

Shri Tyagi: My hon. friend Sardar Hukam Singh feels that we must express our readiness, by making some civil defence arrangements and so on.

[Shri Tyagi]

It would be betraying a little cowardice, I might say. We are a neutral nation. We are quite confident that nobody can attack us. How can we start digging trenches, and in every town, for instance in Delhi, asking people that at an alarm signal everybody must go into the trenches, and give that sort of civil defence training now? It will be bad. It will be like.

पेश अज़ मंग वावेला

The meaning of this is that the wife started crying before her husband died!

Sardar Hukam Singh: You would have to cry after his death like a widow.

Shri Tyagi: The question of U.S. aid was raised. I must at once say that it is not the U.S. aid to Pakistan that has induced us to be more in readiness. When my hon. friends on either side ask me, "What are you doing after this U.S. aid to Pakistan"? I have to tell them, "I am sorry, I have done nothing, except that there is consistent care on our part to remain in vigilance and be self-contained and, as far as possible, self-sufficient. That very attempt has been slightly more accelerated. Except that, I have done nothing else". I must openly confess this.

Shri C. P. Matthen (Thiruvella): Am I to understand that the U.S. aid to Pakistan means nothing and makes no difference in policy or strategy according to my hon. friend?

Shri Tyagi: That is another matter. What I say is this. Our policy of keeping our Armed Forces in perpetual readiness has not been affected by the U.S. aid to Pakistan. That vigilance still remains. This aid has not affected our vigilance, except that we have accelerated our pace a little more.

We have objected to and protested against this U.S. aid to Pakistan on many grounds. The Prime Minister has already mentioned them the other day on the floor of this House; so, I need not dilate upon them. Among other reasons, one point which I would mention is that Pakistan and we are, for the time being, in a state of belligerency.

Shri S. S. More: The hon. Minister contradicts himself.

Shri Tyagi: There is a state of belligerency between us on account of Kashmir. They, as aggressors, attacked Kashmir; we went to protect our territory; and there was a regular warfare. At present, when there is a cease-fire, and we are both waiting for a compromise on some issue,—the U.N. representatives are there, as you know, and the cease-fire line also is there—we objected to this aid at this juncture. Among other grounds, there was one, *viz.* that we are in a state of dispute, and just then, a common friend is throwing arms into one nation when the two of us are facing each other at a cease-fire line. To do so is, I think, unconventional, and, therefore, we objected to it.

We also objected to this aid basically on the grounds which the Prime Minister stated, and which I need not repeat, namely, that there was a bloc of neutrality, and the shrinkage of that bloc and the process of war getting nearer our home—I mean the cold war—was not welcome to us. We also protested on that ground. There are other grounds too.

One other ground which I do personally feel and which those of my hon. friends who have participated in the freedom movement of the country might feel, is that we fought for freedom, and we got freedom both for India and for Pakistan. In fact, Pakistan got freedom on account of the pains and labours put in by Indians; here are many of my hon. friends who put in their best towards the freedom movement. So, we do not want even Pakistan's freedom to be

interfered with, because that was also won by us. Pakistan's leaders might like to compromise, if they choose, their freedom. It depends upon their policies. But when it becomes a question of the complete freedom of Pakistan being compromised or its being in risk, then, we in India also feel that, after all, it is not good. Pakistan is our neighbour, and I tell you, we in India wish Pakistan very well; we have no ambitious eyes cast on Pakistan; we have no intention of any aggression towards Pakistan; never is that our desire. We want Pakistan to thrive, and we would have been very happy if the U.S.A., instead of giving arms aid to Pakistan, had helped our friends and our brothers with economic aid and had made their conditions better. That would have pleased us much more, because we want a better, a more prosperous Pakistan. It is better and safer for us. Therefore, from that point of view also, we felt that our neighbouring country, after getting aid from a foreign country, should not compromise their freedom. I do not know whether the aid has come or not—I do not want to commit myself about it. But if, after getting aid from a bigger or major Power, and that too on certain conditions, there is a little danger of compromising one's own freedom and sovereignty.

I say that a sovereign nation must have all the freedom of action, because the freedom of action is the privilege of a sovereign nation. Any curtailment of that freedom is the curtailment of the sovereignty of that nation. Therefore, we have not relished the idea of U.S. aid to Pakistan on many grounds. But that has not perturbed us very much. The U.S.A., I am sure, has not given this aid to Pakistan with the intention of provoking Pakistan to attack India. We are quite sure about it that that is not the intention of the U.S.A.

डा० राम सुभग सिंह : तो फिर इंटेंशन क्या है ?

58 PSD

Shri Tyagi: Whatever be their intention, surely they do not intend to arm Pakistan to attack India.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Basirhat): What is your interpretation, then?

Shri Tyagi: Pakistan might use that aid for that purpose or might not—that is another matter. But my point is that we feel sure that the U.S.A. never wanted to help Pakistan to invade India or do anything like that.

Dr. N. B. Khare (Gwalior): The Prime Minister said so the other day.

Mr. Chairman: Let there be no interruptions.

Shri Tyagi: If Pakistan, influenced by her local circumstances, sometimes chooses to use those weapons against India, then, I am afraid it will not be possible for the U.S.A. to stop Pakistan from doing so whatever be the conditions on which the weapons have been given. Therefore, it is very natural that India must take care to know how much of weapons is being taken by Pakistan, what is the position and how do we stand in fire-power compared with Pakistan. That is always kept in view, and the Defence Ministry and the External Affairs Ministry are not sleeping over it. We are taking due notice of our relative fire power compared with Pakistan and other neighbours.

As the Prime Minister stated, we can best meet aggression by our general spirit of resistance, because that is the first weapon of a nation.

Shri S. S. More: You mean, non-violence?

Shri Tyagi: Of course, non-violence is not meaningless. After all, nobody today can question the potentiality of non-violent strength. It has already shown results, and even after that, if today the non-violent power of resistance is questioned. I am simply surprised at the intelligence of the questioner.

Shri Bogawat (Ahmednagar South): Especially that of one who once practised it.

Shri Tyagi: The real strength lies in the fact as to how far that resistance goes: how widespread it is; and how deep-rooted it is. If a people who were under foreign rule could throw off the foreign yoke non-violently, if they could do that non-violently, the same can well be done with wars. Therefore, when the Prime Minister said that we need not have long range costly weapons, he was right.

Shri V. G. Deshpande (Guna): He never said so.

Shri Tyagi: He said so, and he was right, because if that strength, if that power of resistance, is there in the people, if there is unity in the cause of the defence of India, then there need be no fear. People can very well resist aggression, of whatever shape it may be.

My hon. friend on the other side, the Lady Member, the other day stated that China had no big weapons and yet they have succeeded in their revolution. That is true. That was possible because the people of China had their power of resistance, and they resisted successfully.

About violence and non-violence, I am afraid now Acharya Kripalani has come into the House and I cannot speak on this subject, which I consider as his monopoly. It is his copyright to interpret Gandhiji, because he knows more about Gandhiji than I do. But I somehow feel instinctively that even our violent resistance with rifles against the aggressor is not an act of violence, according to Gandhiji.

Some Hon. Members: No, no.

Shri Tyagi: According to Gandhiji, as I read him, our facing the enemy with rifles and fire-arms is not violence. To face the aggressor with this little so-called violence will not be a violent act. It will be *satyagraha*, only so long as the whole nation stands united. If it is the way of expression of the nation, the nation must express itself in that manner. I do not think there is any violence involved in Defence because the violence lies in the motive. What is the motive? Is there any selfish motive? Is there a bad motive? Are we the aggressors? Then, the question of violence comes in. If the motive is absolute *satya*, where is the question of violence? We want to defend our own freedom. We have no evil eye on our neighbour. We want prosperity for our neighbour. If in spite of that, the neighbour feels like invading us, we will defend ourselves. I think that is purely *satyagraha*.

Shri S. S. More: May I know why an armed expedition was sent against the tribals in the North-East instead of a batch of non-violent Congressmen. (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. The hon. Minister is not giving way. This is not the question-hour.

Shri Tyagi: All that I submit is that I have no fear of aggression from them. Let it be made quite clear that although preparations for our defence are there, as I have said always, it does not mean that we are in the least afraid of any immediate aggression on India. There is no such fear. Therefore, the country need not feel alarmed on this account.

The House has spoken very well of the soldiers. I assure the House that the soldiers are the only race which are the gayest, after a pack of birds. The soldiers, as a rule, are a gay community. They are always very happy. If they fight a war, they fight it with zest. They never regret the wounds. That is what the soliders are. Whenever they come together some sort of a hypnotic influence is created and they live in that atmosphere. I would very much plead that they must be left to themselves. We should take

particular care to see that they are kept in comfortable environments, in healthy environments. Their people should be kept always happy and contented. That should be our outlook; that should be our anxiety. We should lay stress on that. I think Members of Parliament from all sides of the House have stressed this point, that is, welfare of the soldiers. I may assure the House that the three Army Chiefs including the two who are Englishmen—I have sat with them in so many committees—are the best advocates of the cause of the soldiers and their demands. Whenever anything occurs and they feel that there is a demand which should be met, they go on persistently putting the case of the soldiers before the Government. The pensions which have recently been granted were granted because these three Chiefs who are the sole guardians of the soldiers and their welfare, fought their case very well. I think therein lies the loyalty of the soldiers. Right from the Commander-in-Chief down to the Lieutenant, every officer stands by his soldiers and therefore the soldiers stand by their officers. That is the type of relationship. I am afraid somebody must have carried wrong news to our hon. Lady Member, Shrimati Renu Chakravartty, that there is a lot of difference in pay and also a sort of lack of understanding between officers and soldiers. There is nothing like that.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: See the pay which you have published in your own booklet.

Shri Tyagi: I must first assure the hon. Lady Member that pay apart, otherwise, their relationship is very good. They stand by one another. The officers are very sincere to their soldiers and the soldiers are equally loyal to their officers. That is the relationship between them.

Shri Nambiar (Mayuram): Question.

Shri G. P. Sinha (Palamau cum Hazaribagh *cum* Ranchi): That is an eye sore.

Shri Tyagi: My hon. friend is under some wrong impression. I think my hon. friend can question and smile. He has not yet succeeded I know. I know the soldiers are in good tune.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Make that relationship somewhat more substantial in respect of pay.

Shri Bogawat: Is this question-hour?

Mr. Chairman: Order, order.

Shri Tyagi: Only if my hon. friend could have a glimpse of the barrack life of the soldiers, she could have an idea. I have been a soldier. I know the soldiers and I know how loyal they are and what their relations are.

I will now come to the question of their pay. My friends perhaps think that it is the monetary consideration alone that gives morale to the soldiers. It is not so. I have no time to go into all that. I must assure the House that it is something, some third personality—I do not know what it is, I cannot define that, but I have seen it in experience—that controls the activities of individuals in barracks; the environment or atmosphere, I do not know what it is. Everybody stands for the whole company. There is a sort of a new type of civilisation created, in which they live and add more richness to it. That is the way in which the soldiers live. They forget where they come from. They have got their own environments. Man being a social animal, they have got the best society and friends among themselves and they are happy. They have more intimate friends among themselves, and are more intimate than politicians generally are between themselves.

About pay, I made enquiries. In other countries also there is always a difference between the salary of the General and the Private, practically

[Shri Tyagi]

everywhere. It ranges from 10, 20 or 30 times in many countries. It is no use my giving all those details. In Russia also, of course which claims to have brought about parity everywhere except in intelligence, the pay differs. I think there is a difference of 10 or 12 times between the pay of a Private and the pay of a Major-General. In China, there may not be so much of difference: I do not know. In China, the army is a new experiment. It is a good experiment: I do not know.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: You are new also.

Shri Tyagi: Our experiment is not new. It is a very old one. We are going on the experience of centuries. But, they have taken a risk. They are now going on with that. I think it will be successful. We are very sorry, we cannot take to that experiment in the times of today. As I said, the whole basis is the readiness of the Armed Forces. On this occasion it will be changing horses in midstream. It is not possible now to change the set-up. I understand the people's army there comes on a mass basis. That is my meaning when I say, that a total consciousness of defence should be created all over the country. That is the purpose for which the Government is striving hard and if those conditions of patriotic conscience and circumstances are successfully nursed, I am sure that the conditions better than in China would prevail here.

The hon. Lady Member had quoted that the pay of a *jawan* was only Rs. 25 or 30. But, she has forgotten that the pay along with the other amenities given to him, dearness allowance, etc., the total comes to Rs. 119 for the lowest paid sepoy in India. That is the monthly expenditure incurred on the upkeep of a sepoy, on his food and other things.

Dr. Jaisoorya (Medak): Annual or monthly?

Shri Tyagi: Monthly.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Including pensions?

Shri Tyagi: Of course, not including pensions.

Shri Nambiar: Including rations?

Shri Tyagi: Yes; including rations.

The pay of the second lieutenant is Rs. 350. He is not given any rations. He is not given any other amenities.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: No amenities?

Shri Nambiar: He has got even a family allowance.

Shri Tyagi: He is given Rs. 350 all inclusive.

Shri S. S. More: What is your authority?

Shri Tyagi: I may also take the House into confidence in connection with one matter. Only lately the House has passed a Resolution which the Government has accepted, to make rifle-shooting training common in India as far as practicable. The Government had been considering this scheme, and only the other day I was discussing it with the Home Minister. The Home Minister and myself are both agreed on it. We might perhaps soon be in position to send to each police line, which has a shooting range, each district a few rifles. In the Army, the type of rifle known as ·22 is used for training purposes. It is something which is very cheap, as the ammunition costs only one anna per round. So, the suggestion is that some rifles may be kept in each police line wherever there is a shooting range and facility of storing, perhaps. Defence will be in a position to provide the rifles, and anybody and everybody will have the freedom of going to the police lines, buying his rounds at one anna each, and trying the rifle and thereby learn shooting. So, that is a plan which the Home Minister is considering actively, and I

think we might have that plan sometime in the near future.

Acharya Kripalani (Bhagalpur *cum* Purnea): The Home Minister will provide the occasions for shooting!

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: Non-violently!

Shri Tyagi: My hon. friend can take advantage of this scheme if he is anxious. He will have to go to the police lines.

That will, I think, create an atmosphere among young men. They will know how to shoot, and the oft-repeated demand of many of the Members will thereby be fulfilled.

Shri B. S. Murthy (Eluru): Will the rifle be allowed to be taken to other places?

Shri Tyagi: They cannot take away the rifles to other places. I am sorry my friend will have to be disappointed that way.

Mr. Reddi had said that proper assessment of Budget estimates was not made in the Defence Ministry with the result that crores of rupees lapsed every year. It is a fact, I must confess honestly, that to the extent of that exactitude it has not been possible for the Ministry to assess their requirements from year to year, especially when purchases from foreign countries are involved. There are two or three factors. One is, we assess our requirement on hopes of getting some stores—costly stores—from outside, which may not be fulfilled within the Budget year. Another is, sometimes we negotiate with foreign companies and markets in the hope that negotiations will fructify. Accordingly we estimate our requirements, but during the Budget year the negotiations do not fructify on some ground or other. On examination sometimes things are not found suitable. Like that, that money lapses. There is an example. I find that a foreign firm promised to give us a project report on a very important subject by the month of August, 1953. We immediately got our Budget estimates sanctioned, and the report came in February, 1954. Within February-March, two months, the report could not be fairly examined, and we could not commit ourselves. Therefore, the case had to be postponed. About a crore of rupees which we had provided for will have to lapse. I am very sorry, my hon. friend the Finance Minister is richer by one crore and I am poorer to that extent, but I could not help it.

There were other examples. There was a survey vessel costing about Rs. 2·5 crores. We were intending to place an order for the survey vessel with the Hindustan Shipyard. This year we had budgeted for Rs. 45 lakhs to be given to them. Things have now matured, but Finance could not permit this payment on account because payment can be made only after the contract is signed and commitment is had. I have failed to have any commitment because the scheme could not be completed within the Budget year.

Likewise, there were vehicles worth Rs. 2 crores to be bought from outside. The prototype which was provided by the firm was examined here. It was not found to be to our satisfaction. We could not put through the bargain, we had to give it up. After all, the money which lapses does not go outside the Fund. From one register or one Ministry it goes to the Finance Ministry, and therefore no loss is incurred.

Mr. Reddi had also objected to our sending our shot guns to the United Kingdom for proofing. This was also the subject of a question the other day. It was sent for proofing because it was intended to bring it into the market in competition with the best guns produced in the world. For that purpose it was sent there, and their opinions were had. I am very grateful to the firms which gave us their

[Shri Tyagi]

best opinion. We took advantage of it and now the gun costing only Rs. 400 is competing with the best produced guns of the world today in the market. Very soon, my friends will find that India-produced guns will become a commonplace weapon of India.

Then, a reference was made to the Audit Report where it was mentioned that items available in India are sometimes ordered from outside. My colleague, Shri Satish Chandra had yesterday assured the House that there are Screening Committees already appointed. Two or three Ministries are acquainted with the requirements, and it is after we get the final "yes" from them that the order is placed outside. My colleague on my right, my colleague on my left and others, have all got in their own Ministries Screening Committees. If they know, for instance, that Indian industry can supply the required material, they will immediately stop me from sending the order outside. I am sure therefore there will be no such risk in the future.

Friends have objected to the reduction of the budget of the ordnance factories this year. The House need not get alarmed on that account, because we had piled up quite enough of raw material, and that material had to be eaten into. Otherwise, it would be spoiled. And therefore, for this material we did not provide our annual requirement. We are eating into the old material. Then, the demand also has not increased because fortunately—I must not say, unfortunately—there were no wars during these years, therefore our weapons and our equipment could not be consumed. When there is no war, the equipment is not consumed. So, production has to be a little slack. There are quite a few new items which have been taken up for development. They will take time. For these reasons, the budgetary estimate for the factories is slightly less, but it does not mean that the factories are working less. This year alone, I may inform the House, equipment worth about Rs. 12·3 crores have been manufactured in our factories here. I would like hon. Members who take interest to see the ordnance factories. If any hon. Member friends desire to see them, our factories are open to them. I can arrange their visit. It is not possible for me to narrate the work which the ordnance factories are doing. As I said, it is not such an industry which I could place before the House for everybody to see. There was a very interesting canard going around about the stealing of a file from an ordnance factory. Some of my hon. friends on the other side have always come out with this song. I have made inquiries about it. My Ministry got the information about the stealing of this file, through a dismissed employee, in the month of February 1951. He was a dismissed officer, and he had a lot of litigation with Government also.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy (Mysore): Why was he dismissed?

Shri Tyagi: He was dismissed for indiscipline or something else. I have not enquired into that, and I am not going into that just now.

This dismissed officer gave the information that one of the files which dealt with the manufacture of three-inch mortar bombs had been stolen and sent to Pakistan, by one Mr. Cook, an Englishman, who was the Manager of the factory. As it was very sensational, the matter was enquired into.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: What was the result?

Shri Tyagi: I am coming to that. The result was that the file was actually missing. I do not know whether it went to Pakistan, or it was indeed missing. Anyhow, the

fact was that it was missing. Perhaps, it may be true that it was taken out, and probably sent to Pakistan.

Shri Gidwani (Thana): Are you taking sufficient precautions to see that this is not repeated?

Shri Tyagi: Yes. But, luckily, one morning, when the sweeper was sweeping the floor, he found one of the papers of that file. We wondered how a paper belonging to a missing file was found in the sweepings. So, we started searching that section, in the verandah of which this paper was found. In one of the racks, the file was found torn in many pieces, and a huge packet of these pieces was also found in one of the book-holes. So the file was in a torn condition, and it never went to Pakistan. I might assure the House that even if the file had been sent to Pakistan, Pakistan would not make any use of this, because the person who used to deal with the manufacture of that weapon here has opted for Pakistan. He is a Muslim, and he is now perhaps the Director of their factories. So, they know that there is nothing secret in this, and this weapon is almost being manufactured there. Moreover, the specifications of the U.K. equipment were always available to Pakistan. So, this canard that the file was sent to Pakistan was quite meaningless and was meant to defame the Manager of the factory, who was perhaps instrumental in dismissing that employee. The dismissed employee started all this canard that the file was sent to Pakistan, and so on. Actually, there is no question of the file having gone to Pakistan.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy *rose*—

Shri Tyagi: My time is precious. You can know it later on.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy *rose*.—

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. What is the use of rising again and again, when the hon. Minister is not yielding?

Shri Tyagi: My hon. friend, Sardar A. S. Saigal said that the pay bill of the E.M.E. officers is being increased, while that of the Other Ranks is getting reduced, and he wanted to know the reason for it. The reason is this. For a long time, we have been carrying on with lesser number of E.M.E. officers; the number of officers has always been less than the sanctioned strength in the past. Now, that strength is being made up, and naturally, the bill for their pay is rising.

In regard to the Auxiliary Territorial Army, my hon. friend Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad said that seven days' training was not enough. As I said earlier, the criticisms and suggestions made in this regard are being collected and tabulated. Next month, we are going to have a meeting of the Advisory Board on the Auxiliary Territorial Army. All these suggestions will be placed before that Board who will consider what should be done in this regard.

As for the Territorial Army, I must say that the strength of it is not so small as my hon. friends suggested. I am very sorry, the criticism that the strength of the Territorial Army is very small will not provoke me to give the exact figures of the soldiers in the Territorial Army. But I might say that the response to the Territorial Army has not been very poor, being about 67 per cent. in urban areas, and about 80 per cent. in rural units.

Further, there was criticism in regard to the compulsory enrolment of Government servants. I would like to say that this has not been done by way of any alarm or in a huff. It is a well-considered scheme. I am glad that the officers of the Government of India and other State Governments will have offered for national service. Let the country know that right from the top officers of Government down to the lowest ranks, everybody is prepared to be up in arms against any aggressor. (*Interruption*).

[Shri Tyagi]

There was some talk about some retrenchment in the ordnance factories. I must say that there had been no retrenchment, and the ordnance factories are today carrying on their rolls about two thousand to three thousand extra labourers. Attempts are being made to provide them with work, but they are a drain on the nation's exchequer. However, that is another matter. From the point of the labourers, it is urged by the trade unions that they must be kept. But after all, it is the taxpayers' money that is involved here. About two thousand to three thousand labourers are extra on the rolls, without much of work to do, but attempts are being made to find them more work.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER *in the Chair.*]

I hope quite a lot of them will be given some type of work or other. I am grateful to the administration of the ordnance factories, and the secretariat handling these matters, for having raised the quantum of civilian production from about Rs. 65 lakhs last year, to about Rs. 120 lakhs this year. By the end of March, the total production for civilian requirements will be about Rs. 185 lakhs. So, no one has been retrenched from the ordnance factories. Nor is it the intention of Government to give effect to any retrenchment proposals. They are looking forward to more work, and as additional work comes up, we shall try to consume some of this labour.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: What about depots?

Shri Tyagi: In the depots, it is very difficult to keep them, because the work in the depots is not one of production, but the care and maintenance of goods already in possession. I cannot ask them to put the goods outside, and then bring them inside; this is all too much to expect.

I am very grateful to my hon. friend Shri G. S. Singh for his remarks. He knows quite a lot of the structure of the Armed Forces. His valuable suggestions have been noted, and I can assure him that they will be looked into. While he was very generous about the Army and the soldiers, he had a dig at me. I want to clarify that point here. He said that I was spoiling the discipline, by asking the junior officers to have direct contacts with me, and to place their grievances before me directly. But it is not so. This I would like to clarify. Although I love to talk to the younger officers, and I want them also to say to me their grievances, because they are the youngest in the family, and they must therefore have approach to the eldest in the family, I must say that this is not so. No discipline has been spoiled,—it is all maintained very perfect. Only recently a circular has been issued at my initiative, that no officer is permitted to make an approach to Government, except through proper channel. My officers have come and asked me, what about those letters which are received through Members of Parliament and other politicians. I told them, "no", officers will not be permitted to represent their grievances through any politicians either. Orders have been issued some two or three months ago that any officer making such approaches will be penalised for indiscipline. This is with regard to the persons serving in the Armed Forces. As far as labour is concerned, there are their unions for that purpose, and I am encouraging them. If they have to submit any representations, they might proceed through these unions.

Shri Nambiar: Recognise these unions, please.

Shri Tyagi: As it is already three o'clock, I would not like to dilate more. I hope I will have many other occasions to clarify any further points.

I am sure, the House was not at all suspicious about the defence arrangements.

Several Hon. Members: No.

Shri Tyagi: I can assure this House that our soldiers will take this debate in the best light, for generally Members have shown their interest in the welfare of soldiers, and this is a thing which the soldiers would love to hear and read. I have seen these soldiers myself, and I can give an assurance to the House, and through the House to the country that in times of need, your soldiers, sailors and airmen will not betray your confidence but will stand by you. As they are very loyal, they will stand by you with loyalty, and they will face all risks, and defend the country in the best manner possible.

3 P.M.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I will now put all the cut motions relating to the Defence Ministry to the vote of the House.

The cut motions were negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now, I will put the Demands to the vote of the House.

The question is:

"That the respective sums not exceeding the amounts shown in the third column of the Order Paper in respect of Demands Nos. 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 114 be granted to the President, to complete the sums necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1955, in respect of the corresponding heads of Demands entered in the second column thereof."

The motion was adopted.

[*The motions for Demands for Grants which were adopted by the House are reproduced below*—Ed. of P.P.]

DEMAND No. 11—MINISTRY OF DEFENCE

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 25,11,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1955, in respect of 'Ministry of Defence'."

DEMAND No. 12—DEFENCE SERVICES, EFFECTIVE—ARMY

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,46,36,32,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1955, in respect of 'Defence Services, Effective—Army'."

DEMAND No. 13—DEFENCE SERVICES, EFFECTIVE—NAVY

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 11,16,39,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1955, in respect of 'Defence Services, Effective—Navy'."

DEMAND No. 14—DEFENCE SERVICES, EFFECTIVE—AIR FORCE

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 32,91,25,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1955, in respect of 'Defence Services, Effective—Air Force'."

DEMAND No. 15—DEFENCE SERVICES, NON-EFFECTIVE CHARGES

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 14,40,83,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1955, in respect of 'Defence Services, Non-Effective Charges'."

DEMAND No. 16—MISCELLANEOUS EXPENDITURE UNDER THE MINISTRY OF DEFENCE

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 5,17,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1955, in respect of 'Miscellaneous Expenditure under the Ministry of Defence'."

DEMAND No. 114—DEFENCE CAPITAL OUTLAY

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 18,37,92,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1955, in respect of 'Defence Capital Outlay'."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House will now take up the Demands relating to the Ministry of Education. The Demand Numbers are 17, 18, 19, 20 and 21. I shall now place before the House all the demands.

DEMAND No. 17—MINISTRY OF EDUCATION

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 37,56,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1955, in respect of 'Ministry of Education'."

DEMAND No. 18—ARCHAEOLOGY

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 44,72,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1955, in respect of 'Archaeology'."

DEMAND No. 19—OTHER SCIENTIFIC DEPARTMENTS

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,00,53,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1955, in respect of 'Other Scientific Departments'."

DEMAND No. 20—EDUCATION

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 11,13,30,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1955, in respect of 'Education'."

DEMAND No. 21—MISCELLANEOUS DEPARTMENTS AND EXPENDITURE UNDER THE MINISTRY OF EDUCATION

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 30,17,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1955, in respect of 'Miscellaneous Departments and Expenditure under the Ministry of Education'."

Cut motions may kindly be handed over to the Secretary.

Inadequate provision for education

Shri V. P. Nayar (Chirayinkil): I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Education' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Patronage to expensive public Schools

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Basirhat): I beg to move:

> "That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Education' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Pay of officers

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: I beg to move:

> "That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Education' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Status and conditions of service of teachers

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: I beg to move:

> "That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Education' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Scales of pay for teachers

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: I beg to move:

> "That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Education' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Women's education

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: I beg to move:

> "That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Education' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Teaching through the medium of mother tongue

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: I beg to move:

> "That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Education' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Sound Educational policy

Shri Bahadur Singh (Ferozepur-Ludhiana—Reserved—Sch. Castes): I beg to move:

> "That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Education' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Inadequate provision for education

Shri Bahadur Singh: I beg to move:

> "That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Education' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Universal compulsory primary Education

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

> "That the demand under the head 'Education' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Scholarship to Backward Class students

Shri Boovaraghasamy (Perambalur): I beg to move:

> "That the demand under the head 'Education' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Report of the Secondary Education Commission

Shri Barrow (Nominated—Anglo-Indians): I beg to move:

> "That the demand under the head 'Education' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The time allotted for this Ministry is from 3 P.M. to 5 P.M.—two hours. How long does the hon. Minister propose to take?

منسٹر آف ایجوکیشن اینڈ نیچرل ریسورسز اینڈ سائنٹیفک ریسرچ (مولانا آزاد) : مجھ کو بہت تھوڑا وقت چاہئے - اس لئے کہ میں نے ارادہ کر لیا تھا کہ میں اپنی طرف سے منسٹری کے کاموں پر کچھ ریویو نہیں کروں گا - کیونکہ اس کی کوئی ضرورت نہیں ہے ۔ پچھلے سال میں کاموں کا

[مولانا آزاد]

نقشہ ہاؤس کے سامنے رکھ چکا ہوں - رپورٹ نکل چکی ہے - اب اس سال بحث ہو جانے کے بعد اگر کچھ باتیں ایسی ہوئیں جن کے صاف کرنے کی ضرورت ہوئی - تو میں ان کو صاف کرنے کی کوشش کروں گا - میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ میرے لئے ۱۵ - ۲۰ منٹ کافی ہوں گے -

The Minister of Education and Natural Resources and Scientific Research (Maulana Azad): I require very little time because I had decided that I on my behalf will not like to review the activities of the Ministry. It is not necessary to do so. Last year I had placed before the House an outline of the activities, the Report has also been published. This year if during the discussion any such points came up that require clarification then I will try to clarify them. I think 15 or 20 minutes would be sufficient for me.]

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We have an hour and twenty minutes. I will allow ten minutes to a spokesman from each Group. There are four Groups.

Some Hon. Members: Fifteen minutes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If the four Groups take away that time and then the hon. Minister speaks, what about the 350 Members of the Congress? What will they have?

Shri Nambiar: The Minister represents them.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The Minister or the Government represents the whole of India.

Therefore, that is the time allotted. In a period of four hours, I can allow 15 minutes. In a period of only two hours, I am not able to give more than 10 minutes.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta North-East): As the Congress Party have no cut motions to these demands, will it not be reasonable for you to allow them less time?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It does not depend on the cut motions. Whosoever wants may move cut motions. Others will also speak. Does Acharya Kripalani want to speak? I have his name here.

Acharya Kripalani: You want me to speak only for ten minutes? I am afraid it will be impossible.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The Business Advisory Committee agreed to these two hours.

Acharya Kripalani: This is, Sir, the importance that is given to education. I do not know whether our Education Minister appreciates it?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I want to tell hon. Members one thing. There is, unfortunately, an impression going on constantly that the Chair is responsible for this. Somebody—an unknown figure—is responsible for all the time. There is the Business Advisory Committee. Seventeen days were allotted for the budget demands—Ministry after Ministry. The spokesmen of every Group—including the P.S.P.—were there. What is the good of complaining on the floor of the House?

Shri S. S. More: May I bring one thing to your notice? According to the procedure, the Business Advisory Committee's report ought to be placed before this House to give this House an opportunity to discuss, at least for half an hour. That procedure is never followed.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I do not think anybody took exception to it. The Group leaders were there. The Communist Group was represented; the P.S.P. Group was there. Every hon. Member there consented. As a matter of fact, if they were not interested in a particular subject, they were prepared to allow only one minute. But

here all objections are raised, as if I am sitting tight!

مولانا آزاد - اس میں اور وقت ضائع جا رہا ہے -

[**Maulana Azad**; Much time is being wasted in this.]

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं क्या करूं ?

Acharya Kripalani: Sir, I was not blaming you, but I was only pointing out the importance that is given to Education.

Every politician and every educationist today complains about the system of education under which our youths are being trained. The public are shocked by certain things that have and are happening in schools, colleges and universities. One would have thought that Education would be the first thing that would receive our attention, because, as we train our youths, so will our future society be. I do not say that there have been no efforts to bring about reform in education. But they have been of a very queer type. As I said before in this House, as soon as we came in power, we wanted to reconstruct our Education from the top. First we appointed a University Commission. Then, after a few years, we appointed a Commission for Secondary Education and then, I suppose a few years afterwards we will appoint a Committee for Primary Education.

Shri S. S. More: Then for nursery schools!

Acharya Kripalani: This is not the way to bring about any radical reform in education. Then the Centre seems to be more concerned with culture, by establishing Academies for dance, music and drama rather than with spreading education. I believe that these things should come after there has been a wide diffusion of learning. We are, I am afraid, following the pattern that was set by our ancients when we had one or two classes of people who were highly educated and the rest of the population was utterly ignorant. So that afterwards what happened was that the ignorance of the population overtook the two higher classes and they also became equally ignorant.

Every comprehensive revolution, whatever its inspiration is—spiritual, political, social or economic—tackles first the question of education, because every revolution wants to build the character of the citizen in conformity with the aims of the revolution. Here we have achieved as we believe, a revolution, yet the system of education has remained absolutely the same. This system of education we denounced before we came into power, but it seems that we believe that the touch of the native is so ennobling that a defective system of education, at once turns into a national system of education and into a scientific system of education!

How does the mother educate the child? She gives it useful and practical information. But beyond that she wants to train the child in the society in which he has to live and work.

Further we have heard that education is concerned with the building of character. What is the significance of building of character? You cannot build character of an individual in a vacuum. Character is built in social surroundings. If a society is a military then the character of the individual has to be trained in that direction. If it is a commercial society, the character of the individual is trained towards his social surroundings, towards social requirements and surroundings. An industrial society has a bias towards making the character which will satisfy industrial needs. Therefore, whenever there has been a revolution, whether it has been spiritual, political or economic or social, the system of education has changed. We find this illustrated in periods of history which are distinguishable

[Acharya Kripalani]

from other periods. The first mark a new period in history is that educational system has changed. Before independence, what did we do? Every phase of the independence movement had to tackle the question of education. In the beginning there were the Arya Samajists who wanted to have some kind of revival. They opened their *Gurukuls*. Then, in the national movement, after the partition agitation, there was a demand for national education, in conformity with the ideals of that revolution. This was one of the points at dispute in the Surat Congress; the moderates wanted to keep the system of education as it was and the nationalists or the extremists wanted to change it. Afterwards, there was the phase of the Home Rule agitation under Mrs. Besant. Then again, there was a change in the type of education. After that, in 1920, when Mahatma Gandhi wanted our students to quit the orthodox educational institutions, he provided them with national institutions. After some time, he evolved a new system of education, as his political, his social and his economic ideas progressed. He found that the only system of education suited to a casteless and classless society would be what he called basic education. In our own history, we find that whenever a revolution is sought to be established, the first thing that is tackled is education.

In Soviet Russia, they 'polytechnised' education. What is the meaning of that? They wanted to create a new classless society and the pupil must be trained to fit in that society. The growing mind must fit in the new Communist society. Therefore, the Russians devised a new pattern of education, which suited their classes society.

We have, from the very beginning an aristocratic education. As a matter of fact, formal education has been throughout history more or less aristocratic, confined to the higher and leisured classes, confined to the richer classes and the poor people got some practical education in their handicrafts, in their agriculture and commerce. They have no part or lot in formal education through schools and colleges. Our education still continues to be a class education. It is meant only for the upper classes, the lower classes have no part or lot in it; and every effort of ours is directed to make it more class conscious than it was before independence. Every cultural association that is formed is meant for the upper classes. Not only that but its benefits are confined to capital cities, and mostly to Delhi. It is very strange that the authorities should want to pump culture in Delhi. I think the effort will miserably fail because there is no atmosphere for culture in this city.

Our educational budget has increased ten times. It is not sufficient, I know. But, it is more than sufficient for the task the Ministry has undertaken. We are wasting our money. Having increased our budget we are working without a plan, we are working without an ideal in education, we are working without first deciding what is going to be the shape of our society in the future. Is it going to be the old Hindu society, divided into the Brahmins, Kshatriyas, the Vaisvas and the Sudras? If it is to be like that, then I can understand this sort of education. We are trying to create by our present system a class of new Brahmins, while the old kind are still there.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: The Brahmins are always there.

Acharya Kripalani: We are trying to create a new class. Where do the people come in your Akadamis? They are to be found nowhere.

An Hon. Member: They are there.

Acharya Kripalani: That is true.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Is all this relevant? The hon. Minister is not a Brahmin.

Acharya Kripalani: I have got very great respect for the learning of our Education Minister and those who are associated with him. I do believe they are Brahmins of a sort and therefore it is that they are giving a system of education which is more or less Brahminical. They are not thinking of other classes of people.

Shri B. S. Murthy: I think Maulana equates to a Brahmin.

Acharya Kripalani: The question is this. Are we in earnest about creating a classless society? If we are in earnest, then our education must also be classless. Gandhiji used to say that if in India any people want higher education, they must get it at their own expense. Why did he say so? Because, he knew that this was a capitalist society and the rich can and should pay for the education of their children. The State must undertake the duty only for the education for the common people. Those who want any special kind of education must pay for it fully. I do not think that Gandhiji lacked enthusiasm for culture or for refinement because, I believe, nobody can be more cultured and more refined than a truly non-violent man. Non-violence is the criterion of culture and civilisation. You will see that as humanity has advanced, in culture and civilisation, the distinguishing mark is that the common people have learnt the habits of non-violence. Gandhiji held that if we have to create a casteless and classless society, our education must be casteless and classless. We have not to produce through our education merely a class of rulers and those whose children are to rule after them. There should be universal education for every child, whether of rich parents or of poor parents. There should be no special institutions where the rich and the middle classes can send their children. If they send their children to special schools and colleges, they will get class conscious and think that they are superior to others. You cannot build on this basis a classless society. Therefore, I hold the whole conception of education and our approach to it is absolutely wrong and we are wasting our money, that is we are not getting adequate return for the money we spend. In the Centre we are increasing officer after officer. These officers are very worthy people, but they seem to have nothing to do with the education of the masses, with the education of the general public. Therefore, if there is going to be any educational reform, we must know for what pattern of society we are working for, what social order we want to create in this country. If our education is aristocratic, I say, we are wasting our money, we are deluding ourselves and we are deluding our people when we say that we want to establish in India a casteless and classless society. I say, it cannot be done. It is absurd, it is illogical, and I must add that it is even not very honest to say that we are working for a classless society. If we are working for a classless society, the best way is to make our education classless to make our education general and not to make it top-heavy, not to make it one sort of education for the rich and another sort for the poor. It must be a democratic education; it must be an education for all classes and if anybody wants special privileges, he must pay, for those privileges. In India, I can say few people can afford college education and very few people would offer themselves for college education if they had to pay for it. We must, therefore, utilise all the money that we have to give a kind of universal education, and when you have given that, I am sure that culture will take care of itself. It will be the ripe fruit of popular education. Today it is culture that is imposed from above, it is confined to a few people, it is confined to a class, that has grown rich. This is the way in which education has got to be tackled if we are not to fritter away our small resources. For the education to be so designed, I would

[Acharya Kripalani]

even say that some of our military expenditure should be curtailed. We have been told that our military is not worth much under modern conditions it will not be able to do anything against atom bombs and the rest. Why should we waste money on such military arrangements. I have no doubt that more money should be given for education, but not more money for what it is given, at present and no more money to be spent in the fashion it is spent; more money should be spent, not for a few people but for the many. We must first think of a universal education upto the Matriculation standard at least for every citizen, and then, if there are clever students who want higher studies, give them scholarships, provide institutions for them, spend money on them. Just because the rich man's son can afford the money to go to college, he must go there though he may be a congenital idiot this cannot be allowed. Just because a rich man can afford to learn music though he may not have the ear for music, he cannot be allowed to do so. We must select our students from the general mass of students, give them scholarships and send them to colleges, and let the colleges be filled with such students. There will then be no need for giving special scholarships for research and advancement of knowledge. These students themselves will carry on research and advance knowledge.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I find that education being so vast and so important, it is impossible for any hon. Member, particularly the spokesman of any particular Party, to confine himself to ten minutes. I allowed sixteen minutes to Acharya Kripalani and even that was not sufficient. I, therefore, intend making inroads on the Resolution and allot one hour out of it for the demands on Education. After all, the Resolution has been discussed by a Joint Committee and is going to be sent back to the Committee where it will be discussed again. We will have one more hour out of it for Education. I now propose to give fifteen minutes each to the leaders of the groups, and ten minutes each for other speakers.

Shri Radhelal Vyas (Ujjain): Why not postpone the Resolution to some other day and allow the rest of the day completely for Education?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If the Government agrees, I have no objection.

श्री टंडन (जिला इलाहाबाद–पश्चिम): सभापति महोदय, शिक्षा का विषय हमारे भविष्य का निश्चय करने वाला है। अपने देश की रक्षा अवश्य ही बहुत बड़ा विषय है, परन्तु रक्षा के लिये भी बुद्धि की और विद्या की आवश्यकता होती है। इसलिये मेरा सदा यह विचार रहा है कि देश की रक्षा के साथ शिक्षा का क्रम क्या है, शिक्षा चलाने की रीति क्या है, किस तरह से हम अपनें युवकों को भावी कार्यक्रम के लिये तैयार कर रहे हैं, यह सब विषय आ जाते हैं। इसके ऊपर राष्ट्र का बहुत अधिक धन खर्च होना चाहिये।

पिछले कुछ वर्षों के भीतर विश्वविद्यालयों के दीक्षान्त भाषणों में, उन के कनवोकेशनों में, कई शिक्षा विषय के जानकारों ने बार बार यह कहा कि आज का शिक्षा क्रम उचित नहीं है, दूषित है, इसको बदलो। हमारे कई राज्यपालों ने, गवर्नरों ने अपने दीक्षान्त भाषणों में इस बात पर बल दिया है। परन्तु कहा तो कइयों ने, ऊंचे ऊंचे पदाधिकारियों ने, देखने में कोई परिवर्तन दिखाई नहीं दिया। परिवर्तन एक दिन में नहीं होता, बहुत जल्द नहीं होता, यह तो सब ही जानते हैं, परन्तु कुछ निश्चय उधर चलने का दिखाई देता, इस की हम आशा करते थे। अभी जान पड़ता है कि हमारे शिक्षा विभाग ने अपना निश्चय नहीं किया कि भावी शिक्षा का कार्यक्रम क्या हो। आज जो यूनीवर्सिटियां चल रही हैं वे बहुत पुराने समय में बनाई

गई थीं । उनकी कल्पना अंग्रेजों ने अपनी आवश्यकताओं के अनुसार और कुछ अपन इंग्लैंड के कार्यक्रमों के अनुसार की थीं । इंग्लैंड की कई यूनीवर्सिटियां बहुत ऊंची हैं । परन्तु विचार करने की तो बात यह है कि क्या अब भी हम उस मार्ग पर ही चलेंगें जिस पर कि पुराने अंग्रेजों ने हमको चला दिया । मैं निवेदन करता हूं कि हमारे देश की शिक्षा प्रणाली अपने देश की संस्कृति के अनुरूप और आवश्यकताओं के अनुरूप होनी चाहिये । इंग्लैंड की या यूरोप की शिक्षा प्रणाली में जो कुछ अच्छी बातें मिलें उनको हम लें, परन्तु हमें स्मरण रखना चाहिये कि हमारे देश के आदर्श कुछ दूसरे हैं, संस्कृतियों में अन्तर है । हमारा देश कुछ नया देश तो नहीं है हमारे यहां शिक्षा में बहुत प्रयोग पहले भी हो चुके हैं । जो प्रयोग अंग्रेजों ने किया यह इन्होंने अपने ढंग से किया । हमारे पुराने लोगों ने भी किये थे । हमारे विचारने की बात है कि क्या अपने पुराने जो रास्ते थे, उन में कोई अच्छा रास्ता था जिसको अ ा हम अपना सकते हैं । मख्य बात शिक्षा के सम्बन्ध में सोचने की यह है कि हम अपने युवकों को क्या बनाना चाहते हैं । हम क्या केवल उनको पढ़ा लिखा कर अपने देश के जो आवश्यक धंधे हैं, उन में ही लगाने का यत्न करना चाहते हैं या उनके भीतर कुछ नैतिक आदर्श पैदा करना चाहते हैं ?

इसके विषय में मेरा निवेदन है कि हमारे यहां का जो पुराना रास्ता था वह आज के रास्तों की अपेक्षा अच्छा था । विद्यार्थी का जीवन कोमल न हो, अपनी मांग संवारने और हैट, बूट की चिन्ता में उनका रुपया और समय न जाये, किन्तु उनके जीवन में कठोरता हो, कर्मठपन हो, ब्रह्मचर्य की अवस्था में वे सिनेमाओं के शौकीन न हों, वे नाच गाने के आदी न हों, इसके लिये हमें ऐसा वायुमंडल पैदा करना होगा जिसमें ब्रह्मचर्य की रक्षा

हो । उचित यह है कि हम ब्रह्मचर्य के क्रम से अपने विद्यार्थियों को रखें, उनमें ब्रह्मचर्य की शक्ति और तेज पैदा हो, इसकी हम चिन्ता करें, परन्तु आज तो वह चिन्ता नहीं है । दिल्ली में लड़के पढ़ रहे हैं, सहस्रों हैं । लखनऊ में लड़के पढ़ रहे हैं, सहस्रों हैं, शाम को वह कहां कहां जाते हैं, किसी को खबर नहीं । किन किन सिनेमाओं में और घरों में वह घुसते हैं, क्या शौक़ीनी उनके दिमाग में है, क्या कपड़ा पहनते हैं, किस तरह से रहते हैं, कोई गुरु इसको देखता नहीं । अभी हमारे भाई कृपलानी जी ने कुछ थोड़ा सा संकेत किया कि लड़कों ने क्या क्या किया है . . .

श्री विभूति मिश्र (सारन व चम्पारन) : अध्यापकों का भी वही हाल है ।

श्री टंडन : तब शिक्षा विभाग पर और केवल शिक्षा विभाग पर ही नहीं बल्कि हर प्रदेश के शासन पर, केन्द्रीय शासन के केवल शिक्षा मंत्री पर नहीं, बल्कि सब शासनों पर इसका दायित्व है, सब पर एक बड़ी जिम्मेदारी है । अभी एक भाई ने कहा कि अध्यापकों का भी यही हाल है । जब अध्यापक ऐसे हों तो फिर विद्यार्थी किस को देख कर अपने को ढाल सकेंगे . . . . . .

डा० एन० बी० खरे : शासक कैसे होंगे ।

श्री टंडन : समय मेरा थोड़ा है । पुराने समय में गुरु अपने बच्चों से यह आशा करता था—'सत्यम् वद् धर्मम् चर' बच्चों को यह सिखाता था, वह इस से भी ऊपर चढ़ता था और बच्चों के सामने स्वयं अपने को उदाहरणस्वरूप धरता था, वह स्वयं अपने चरित्र को उदाहरण के लिये रखता था, केवल मुंह से ही उन्हें यह नहीं सिखा देता था कि ऐसे बनो, उनके सामने स्वयं को आदर्श स्वरूप रखता था । अब आज अगर ऐसे

[श्री टंडन]

अध्यापक हों जैसे मेरे भाई ने बताया, तो वह कैसे अपने को बच्चों के सामने रख सकते हैं। अगर कभी किसी गुरु में कोई कमजोरी होती भी थी तो भी वह इस प्रकार चेतावनी देता था 'यान्यास्माकं सुचरितानि तानि सेवितव्यानि नो इतराणि'। कैसा ऊंचा वाक्य है। इच्छा होती है कि संसार भर के गुरु इस को रट लेते। 'सुचरितानि' मेरे में जो गुण हैं उन्हीं को ग्रहण करना, 'नो इतराणि' दूसरों को अर्थात् दूषनों को फेंक देना मत ग्रहण करना। आज यह अध्यापकों में शक्ति हो, इसकी आवश्यकता है। आज हमें अपने शिक्षा के क्रम को इस तरह से रखना है, एक आमूल चूल परिवर्तन करना है, जिसमें बच्चों के ऊपर अध्यापकों का अच्छा प्रभाव पड़ सके यह मुख्य बात है, उसका रास्ता ढूंढना पड़ेगा। हमारे पुराने समय में ऋषि कुल कहिये, या गुरुकुल कहिये उसकी प्रथा थी। बच्चे गुरुओं के साथ रक्खे जाते थे और उस समय के गुरु पैसों की चिंता करने वाले नहीं होते थे, पैसे से अचिन्त थे, उन्हें पैसे की फिकर नहीं रहा करती थी। शासन उनको अचिन्त करता था। साधारण उनकी आवश्यकतायें होती थीं। वह कोमलता से जीवन व्यतीत करने वाले नहीं होते थे, उनके जीवन में एक कठोरता और तपस्या होती थी और उनके जीवन को देखकर बच्चे स्वयं अपने चरित्र को उसके अनुकूल बनाते थे। मेरा निवेदन है कि आज उसी प्रकार की युनिवर्सिटियां हों। मैं प्रयाग का रहने वाला हूं भारद्वाज मुनि ने प्रयाग में बहुत बड़ी युनिवर्सिटी बनाई थी। आज दो हजार, तीन हजार लड़कों की संख्या एक संस्था में बहुत मानी जाती है। भारद्वाज कुलपति कहलाये हैं और कुलपति की परिभाषा हमारे कोषों में यह दी है कि जो गुरु दस सहस्र विद्यार्थियों के पढ़ाने का इन्तजाम करे, उनके भोजन का इन्तजाम करे, उसको कुलपति कहते हैं। कुलपति की यह परिभाषा आपको कोष में मिलेगी।

क्या मैं समझूं घंटी धोखे से बज गई या आपने बजाई है?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I deliberately did it.

Dr. S. N. Sinha: The other Members would readily forego their time for Tandonji.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I shall cut it from the Congress Party's time.

पंडित के० सी० शर्मा (जिला मेरठ—दक्षिण) : गम्भीर विषय है।

श्री टंडन : मेरे भाई ने ठीक ही कहा है। चूंकि घंटी बज चुकी है मैं इतना ही निवेदन करूंगा कि इस सम्बन्ध में गम्भीर विचार की आवश्यकता है, गम्भीर विचारकों की आवश्यकता है, उन विचारकों की आवश्यकता है जिनके जीवन में स्वयं तपस्या हो, जो अपनी तपस्या से विचार करके हमारे देश के सामने कुछ मौलिक वस्तु रख सकें और उनके अनुसार स्वयं आचरण करके दूसरों से आचरण करा सकें। मेरा इतना निवेदन है। बस इस विषय को मैं यहीं छोड़ता हूं।

मैं कुछ शब्द शिक्षा के जो अनुदान हैं, ग्रान्ट्स हैं उनके बारे में कहना चाहता हूं। मुझे भाषा के विषय में कुछ शब्द कहने हैं। उस दिन हमारे शिक्षा मंत्री नहीं थे। पांच दिनों की जो बहस यहां पर हुई थी, उसमें मैं ने भी भाग लिया था। मेरी इच्छा थी कि वह उस अवसर पर उपस्थित होते। आज वह उपस्थित हैं और मुझे अवसर मिला है कि मैं थोड़ा सा दिल खोल कर उनके सामने रख दूं ....

डा० एन० बी० खरे : लेकिन वह सो रहे हैं।

श्री टंडन : ऐसी बद बात मत कहिये। मंत्री जी जानते हैं कि मैं हिन्दी का पुराना सेवक हूं। हिन्दी के विषय में बहुत वर्षों से विचार करता रहा हूं, किस प्रकार से उसका काम हो इस पर मैं ने ध्यान दिया है और मेरे जीवन का एक बहुत बड़ा अंश हिन्दी की एक बहुत बड़ी संस्था हिन्दी साहित्य सम्मेलन के चलानें में लगा है।

आज देश में हिन्दी की सब से बड़ी संस्था वह मानी जाती है। इस के अधीन लगभग १८०० केन्द्र इस देश में हैं जहां इस की और इसकी शाखा संस्था की परीक्षायें होती हैं। यह इसका एक काम है। इस की परीक्षाओं में कुल मिला कर दो लाख से ऊपर परीक्षार्थी अर्थात् कैन्डिडेट हर साल बैठते हैं। इस की सब से ऊंची जो परीक्षा है जिस का नाम साहित्य रत्न है, वह आपकी किसी युनिवर्सिटी की ऐम० ए० की कक्षा से नीची नहीं पड़ेगी। जितनी युनिवर्सिटियां हैं जिन को आप अनुदान देते हैं, किसी को २३ लाख, किसी को १२ लाख, किसी को १५ लाख, आप देते हैं। या भिन्न भिन्न राज्य देते है आप के यहां से तीन को अनुदान दिया जाता है और जामिया मिलिया को भी पिछले कुछ वर्षों में ३, ४ और ५ लाख रुपया हर साल किसी न किसी रूप में दिया गया है। कभी २ कभी ३ और कभी ५ लाख दिया गया है। मगर हिन्दी साहित्य सम्मेलन की साहित्य रत्न परीक्षा में इतने परीक्षार्थी बैठते हैं और पास होते हैं जितने कि कुल युनि वर्सिटियों को मिला कर भी नहीं होते हैं। आप इलाहाबाद युनिवर्सिटि, लखनऊ यूनिवर्सिटी दिल्ली युनिवर्सिटी, जामिया मिलिया, कलकत्ता युनिवर्सिटी, बम्बई युनि वर्सिटी, सब को मिला लीजिये कि एम० ए० की परीक्षा में हिन्दी के कितने परीक्षार्थी बैठते हैं, और कितने पास होते हैं इन सबको मिला कर जो संख्या हो उसकी चौगुनी संख्या में हिन्दी साहित्य सम्मेलन तैयार होता है। परन्तु मुझे ऐसा जान पड़ता है कि हमारे शिक्षा विभाग को हिन्दी साहित्य सम्मेलन पर अधिक भरोसा नहीं है। वह इस की तरफ से जैसे आशंकित हैं। सच है, सम्मेलन, हिन्दी के लिये लड़ा था, सम्मेलन के लड़ने पर ही राष्ट्र भाषा का प्रश्न उठा उसकी ओर के प्रति निधि बराबर लड़े कि हिन्दी राष्ट्र भाषा हो। मैं जानता हूं कि हमारे आजके शिक्षा मंत्री की राय थी कि हिन्दी न हो, हिन्दुस्तानी हो, उन का भाषण कान्स्टिटुएन्ट असेम्बली का मौजूद है।

श्री नंद लाल शर्मा (सीकर) : हिन्दुस्तानी कोई भाषा नहीं है।

श्री टंडन : हमारे शिक्षा मंत्री की यह राय थी कि नागरी अक्षर और उर्दू अक्षर दोनों चलाये जायें। कान्स्टिटुएन्ट असेम्बली में यह सवाल बार बार आया, उस के ऊपर राय ली गई और आप सब को मालूम है कि राय का नतीजा क्या हुआ। मुझ को तो कांग्रेस पार्टी के अन्दर जो वोटिंग हुई थी वह भी याद है। परन्तु अब जब हिन्दी स्वीकार हो गई तब मैं यह आशा करता हूं, और हृदय से कहता हूं कि मैं शिक्षा मंत्री का आदर करता हूं, कुछ बातों में मेरा उनका मतभेद है, परन्तु मैं हृदय से उनका आदर करता हूं, आज से नहीं वर्षों से मैं उनको जानता हूं, तो मैं यह आशा करता हूं, कि जब तय हो गया कि हिन्दी चले हिन्दुस्तानी नहीं, उर्दू नहीं, तब हिन्दी के ऊपर बल होना चाहिये, और जिस संस्था ने इतना काम किया है, उसी संस्था के द्वारा हम को कामों को कराने का यत्न करना चाहिये। मगर बात यह है कि हिन्दी साहित्य सम्मेलन या और जो दो एक बड़ी संस्थायें देश में हैं, जो हिन्दी का काम करती आई हैं, उन की ओर से शिक्षा विभाग का मन फिरा हुआ है, और उनकी अवहेलना होती है

[श्री टंडन]

नागरी प्रचारिणी सभा और हिन्दी साहित्य सम्मेलन, यह मुख्य संस्थायें हैं देश में। हिन्दी साहित्य सम्मेलन ने जड़ लगाई मद्रास में दक्षिण भारत हिन्दी प्रचार सभा की। मद्रास में, कुल राष्ट्र भाषा का प्रचार हिन्दी साहित्य सम्मेलन का चलाया हुआ है। दक्षिण भारत हिन्दी प्रचार सभा सम्मेलन की लगाई हुई वस्तु है, सम्मेलन ने इसको आरम्भ किया सम्मेलन की वह शाखा सन् १९२८ में इस लिये स्वतंत्र की गई कि वह हिन्दी का काम स्वतंत्रता से आगे बढ़ावें। आज सम्मेलन की एक शाखा वर्धा में है, राष्ट्रभाषा हिन्दी प्रचार सभा, जिस का आरम्भ गांधी जी और श्री जमना लाल बजाज ने किया। परन्तु जब गांधी जी की नीति में हिन्दी और हिन्दुस्तानी का अन्तर पड़ा तब गांधी जी उस से अलग हो गए, हिन्दी संसार जानता है, दूसरे भी जानते हैं कि गांधी जी और हिन्दी साहित्य सम्मेलन की नीति के बारे में कुछ अन्तर हुआ, और वह अन्तर हिन्दी और हिन्दुस्तानी का हमें कान्स्टिटुएन्ट असेम्बली में दिखलाई पड़ा। प्रश्न यह है कि हम आज हिन्दी चलवायेंगे या हिन्दुस्तानी ? किन शब्दों को आप चलवायेंगे और किस प्रकार से काम करेंगे। मेरा यह निवेदन है कि भाषा के विषय में जो नीति शिक्षा विभाग ने अब तक बरती है वह मानो हिन्दी वालों को हटाकर हिन्दुस्तानी वालों को आगे करने की है। मैं अतिशयोक्ति नहीं करता, म मौलाना से कहता हूं कि आप अपने दिल पर हाथ रखें और सोचें कि कितने हिन्दी वालों को आप ने इस काम के लिये अपनाया है। हिन्दी वाले छिपे नहीं हैं। नागरी प्रचारिणी सभा और हिन्दी साहित्य सम्मेलन के लोक हिन्दी संसार के सामने है।

मेरा यह कहना भी शिक्षा विभाग से है कि उसकी रिपोर्टों से यह तो मालूम होता है कि यह स्कीम बन रही है और यह विचार किया जा रहा है, लेकिन देखना यह है कि क्या ठोस काम पिछले तीन वर्षों में हुआ है। जो काम हुआ है, वह सामने है। कुछ शब्दों के अनुवाद छोटी पुस्तकाओं के रूप में निकले हैं। परन्तु इसके बारे में भी मेरा निवेदन है कि ठीक नीति नहीं बरती जाती। उस दिन मेरे मित्र गोविन्द दास जी ने पूछा था शिक्षा मंत्री से कि क्या जो शब्द निश्चित हो चुके, संविधान में तय हो चुके, कि यह हिन्दी में रहेंगे, उन पर क्या फिर विचार हो रहा है, क्या आप उनको बदलेंगे ? शिक्षा मंत्री ने कहा 'हां'।

مولانا آزاد : آپ غلط کہہ رہے ہیں- میں نے یہ نہیں کہا -

[**Maulana Azad:** You are speaking wrong, I did not say so.]

डा० राम सुभग सिंह : पहले कहा था, बाद में दुरुस्त कर दिया था।

مولانا آزاد : میں نے صرف یہ کہا تھا کہ ایک بورڈ بنایا گیا ہے اس کام کے لئے - وہ ہر طرح کے ٹرمز پر غور کر سکتا ہے - مگر اس بورڈ کے جو ٹرمس آف ریفرینس ہیں ، ان میں یہ کہیں نہیں ہے کہ جن لفظوں کا پہ. فیصلہ ہو چکا ہے. ان کو بھی. پھر نئے سرے سے سوچے -

[**Maulana Azad:** I had only said that a board has been set up for this purpose. It can take into consideration all sorts of terms. But in the terms of reference of this Board it is nowhere mentioned that it may discuss afresh these words also that have previously been decided upon.]

श्री टंडन : उस रोज जो जवाब आप ने दिया था, मुझे ठीक याद नहीं है ...

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Hon. Members will please address the Chair.

श्री टंडन : मैं आप से निवेदन कर रहा हूं कि शिक्षा मंत्री ने जो कहा था, मैं ने उस को सुना नहीं था, मैं मौजूद नहीं था, परन्तु जो आज आप ने कहा कि 'मैं ने यह कहा था कि वह चाहे तो बदल सकते हैं', उस के माने क्या हैं ? मैं यह कह रहा हूं कि संविधान के अन्दर जो तय हो चुका, जिस हिन्दी संविधान पर डाक्टर राजेन्द्र प्रसाद और संविधान सभा के सदस्यों के दस्तखत हैं ....

مولانا آزاد : وہ بدل نہیں سکتے - وہ مشورہ دے سکتے ہیں بدلنے کا ان کو اختیار نہیں ہے -

[**Maulana Azad:** They cannot change. They can only tender advice, but they have no authority to change.]

श्री टंडन : अब सवाल यह है कि बदलेगा कौन ? क्या पार्लियामेंट के सामने वह आवेगा ?

مولانا آزاد : گورنمنٹ - ان کے مشورہ کو دیکھکر پھر آخیر میں گورنمنٹ فیصلہ کرے گی -

[**Maulana Azad:** Government. After taking into consideration the advice tendered by them the Government would take a decision.]

श्री टंडन : इस के जितने नुक्ते थे, मैं ने समझ लिये । लेकिन असर जो चारों ओर शिक्षा विभाग ने डाला वही यह है कि संविधान के कुछ शब्दों को वह बदलने जा रहे हैं । सवाल यह है कि जब कांस्टीट्यूशन के शब्द निश्चित हो चुके हैं तब क्या फिर विभाग द्वारा उनको बदला जा सकता है । हिन्दी में कांस्टीट्यूशन कुछ वर्षों में बना । एक कमेटी बनी जिस ने शब्द तय किये और इस काम पर लाखों रुपया खर्च हुआ । उन शब्दों के अनुसार आपका संविधान आया । जब हम लोग हस्ताक्षर करने को गये तो एक तरफ अंग्रेजी में लिखे कांस्टीट्यूशन पर हमने हस्ताक्षर किये । और दूसरी तरफ हिन्दी में लिखे कांस्टीट्यूशन पर हस्ताक्षर किये आज फिर कोई विभागीय कमेटी इस पर विचार करे कि वह शब्द रखे जायें या न रखे जायं, मैं कहता हूं कि यह बिल्कुल गलत है । शिक्षा विभाग का फिर से किसी बोर्ड को यह अधिकार देना कि तुम उन शब्दों पर फिर से सोचो, मैं कहता हूं कि ......

مولانا آزاد - میں پھر کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ ان کے ٹرمس آف ریفرینس میں اس کا ایک لفظ بھی نہیں ہے - میں نے اُس دن یہہ کہا تھا کہ ہم نے ان کو روکا نہیں ہے - اگر وہ چاہیں تو اپنی رائے دے سکتے ہیں -

[**Maulana Azad:** I want to submit that in the terms of reference there is not a single word like this. The other day what I had said was that we have not debarred them. If they like they can give their advice.]

सेठ गोविन्द दास : (मंडला—जबलपुर—दक्षिण) : उनको रोकना चाहिये ।

مولانا آزاد - میں ابھی تک اس پوزیشن میں نہیں ہوں کہ کہہ سکوں کہ انہوں نے ایسے ایک لفظ کے متعلق بھی مشورہ دیا ہے - میں نے اب چیرمین سے پوچھا ہے - ابھی تک

[مولانا آزاد]

میرے علم میں یہ بات نہیں ہے کہ انہوں نے ایک لفظ کے بارے میں بھی مشورہ دیا ہے -

[**Maulana Azad:** I am not yet in a position to say that they have given advice in the case of even one such word. Now I have enquired from the Chairman. As yet I do not know that they have given advice in respect of even one word.]

श्री टंडन : मैं यह असूल समझता था कि संविधान के शब्दों को छुआ न जाय। मेरा दूसरा निवेदन यह है कि जो काम हो रहा है।

Acharya Kripalani: Cannot there be a revised copy of the Constitution, the original copy remaining in the words that were used at the time we signed it?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have not followed the point. Will he please repeat it?

कुछ माननीय सदस्य : हिन्दी में बोलिये

आचार्य कृपालानी : हां हां बोलता हूं इसमें क्या ऐतराज हो सकता है कि कांस्टीट्यूशन की एक और दूसरी कापी बनाई जाय जिसमें प्रचलित शब्द रखे जायें, और जिस कापी में हमने दस्तखत किये थे वह वैसी ही रहे।

श्री टंडन : कांस्टीट्यूशन एक पवित्र चीज है और जिस पर हस्ताक्षर हो चुके हैं उसको बदलने का सवाल ही नहीं उठता मेरा निवेदन यही है कि यह यत्न नहीं होना चाहिये कि शब्द बदले जायें। हमारे पास काम बहुत है। मेरा मंशा यह है कि शिक्षा विभाग को जो काम करना चाहिये उसमें बहुत देर हो रही है। हम जल्दी में हैं और चाहते हैं कि जल्दी जल्दी काम हो। जो काम हो चुका है उसको दुहराने में तो बहुत समय लग जायगा। हमको तो सन्देह यह है कि १५ वर्ष के बाद कहीं और समय अंगरेजी के लिये मांगने का यत्न न किया जाय।

मैं अब एक दूसरी बात की ओर ध्यान दिलाता हूं। शिक्षा विभाग की तरफ से हिन्दी शिक्षा समिति बनी है। मेरा निवेदन है कि इस हिन्दी शिक्षा समिति में जो हिन्दी के सच्चे प्रतिनिधि होने चाहियें वे नहीं हैं। एक आध हैं। मैं कहता हूं कि देश में हिन्दी साहित्य सम्मेलन और नागरी प्रचारिणी सभा दो मुख्य संस्थायें हैं जिन्हों ने हिन्दी के क्षेत्र में वर्षों से काम किया है। क्या आप उनकी अवहेलना करके हिन्दी का काम करेंगे? यह दोनों संस्थायें जिस भाषा को स्वीकार करेंगी वही भाषा देश में मानी जायेंगी। हिन्दी साहित्य सम्मेलन और नागरी प्रचारिणी सभा जिन शब्दों को चलायेंगे वही शब्द देश में चलेंगे। आपने इन संस्थाओं को छोड़ कर इधर से और उधर से कुछ लोग ले लिए हैं। मेरा यह निवेदन है कि यह हिन्दी का काम करने का रास्ता नहीं है। आपने एक शिक्षा समिति बनायी है। मेरे पास जो आपकी पिछले वर्ष की रिपोर्ट ५२-५३ की छपी है उस में कहा गया है।

"Three sub-committee of the Hindi Shiksha Samiti *have been set up* one each to report on: (1) Hindi Examination, (2) Basic Grammar of the Hindi Language, (3) Hindi Propaganda."

पिछले वर्ष की जो रिपोर्ट मेरे सामने आयी है उस में दिया हुआ है "हेव बीन सेट अप"। हिन्दी परीक्षायें जो चल रही हैं उनकी जांच करने के लिए एक

समिति बनायी गयी हैं । अंग्रेजी में इसको प्रेजट परफेक्ट टैंस कहते हैं । इस का अर्थ हैं कि वह क्रिया समाप्त हो गयी । अब की जो रिपोर्ट निकली हैं उस में प्रेजेंट परफेक्ट टेंस नहीं है बल्कि प्रेजेंट कंटिन्यूस टेंस है । यानी

"A committee is *being set up* to examine the standards of Hindi Examinations conducted by various Hindi organisations."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Possibly it is a mistake of language.

Shri Tandon: Maybe.

यह रिपोर्ट निकली है इस साल परन्तु इस रिपोर्ट के लिखने और छपने के बाद एक दूसरी रिपोर्ट आज आई है :—

"Programme for the Development and Propagation of Hindi." मेरा यकीन है कि यह पिछले पांच छ: दिनों के अन्दर लिखी गई है । इसका भीतरी प्रमाण इसमें हैं । इसमें लिखा है :

"It has been decided to appoint a committee to examine the standards of Hindi Examinations."

और इसमें कमेटी वालों के नाम दिये हुये हैं

"The Committee consists of the following."

पार साल यह तै हुआ था और रिपोर्ट था कि

"These sub-committees will submit their report to the Hindi Shiksha Samiti at the second meeting to be held in February, 1953."

फरवरी १९५३ में उनको रिपोर्ट करना था । लेकिन मालूम होता है कि जब यह रिपोर्ट अभी लिखी गई तब तक यह कमेटी बनी नहीं थी । तो फिर रिपोर्ट करने का सवाल ही नहीं उठता । मालूम होता है कि पिछले ७ या ८ दिनों में यह कमेटी बनाई गई है । अब उसमें जो नाम हैं वह मैं पढ़ता हूं :

1. Shri M. Satyanarayana.
2. Shri Amrit Lal Nanavati.
3. Shri G. P. Nene.
4. Shri N. Nagappa.
5. Shri Rajni Kanta Chakravarti.
6. Shri Ram Dhari Sinha, Dinkar.
7. Shri Jetha Lal Joshi.
8. Dr. Aryendra Sharma.
9. Shri Vijayendra Snatak.
10. Shri Magan Bhai P. Desai.
11. Prof. N. A. Nadvi.

उनमें से बहुतों को तो मैं जानता ही नहीं हूं कुछ को जानता हूं । ज्यादा उनमें ऐसे हैं जिनका नाम मैंने हिन्दी के सम्बन्ध में कभी नहीं सुना । कुछ इसमें ऐसे हैं जिनका नाम हिन्दुस्तानी के साथ बंधा रहा है । जो लोग हिन्दी साहित्य सम्मेलन के विरोधी थे और हिन्दी साहित्य सम्मेलन की परीक्षाओं के विरुद्ध अपनी हिन्दुस्तानी की परीक्षायें चलाने की कोशिश करते थे, उनके इसमें कुछ नाम हैं । मैं यह उचित नहीं समझता कि मैं वैयक्तिक बात कहूं । अस्तु मैं कहता हूं कि इसमें हिन्दी साहित्य सम्मेलन का और नागरी प्रचारिणी सभा का कोई आदमी नहीं है । मुनासिब था कि उनसे सलाह तो की जाती । सबसे बड़ा स्थान हिन्दी संसार में हिन्दी साहित्य सम्मेलन का है जिसकी परीक्षाओं में हर साल दो लाख से ऊपर परीक्षार्थी बैठते हैं । उसका एक आदमी नहीं और जो छोटी छोटी परीक्षायें लेने वाली संस्थायें हैं, उनको इसमें जगह दी गई है और वह हिन्दी साहित्य सम्मेलन के ऊपर बैठकर उसकी परीक्षाओं के लिये जज का काम करेंगी । इस से साफ पता चलता है कि हमारा शिक्षा विभाग उन लोगों को सहारा देना चाहता है जो कि उस तरफ

[श्री टंडन]

नहीं आना चाहते जिधर कि हिन्दी की मुख्य संस्थाओं की प्रवृति है बल्कि उस प्रवृति से हट कर काम करना चाहते हैं।

दूसरा उदाहरण मैंने उस दिन दिया था डिक्शनरी का। आपको डिक्शनरी बनवानी है। हिन्दी साहित्य सम्मेलन ने अब तक कितने कोष बना दिये। नागरी प्रचारिणी सभा का शब्द सागर हिन्दी का सबसे ऊंचा कोष है। नागरी प्रचारिणी सभा को यह काम सुपुर्द नहीं हुआ, हिन्दी साहित्य सम्मेलन को नहीं हुआ। कोई संस्था है 'हिन्दुस्तानी कल्चर सोसाइटी' इलाहाबाद में जिसको अधिक लोग जानते नहीं हैं। उसका दफ्तर कहां है? शायद किसी के रहने के घर में कुछ काम होता हो। अब आपने उस संस्था को इस काम के लिये ६०,००० रुपये दिये हैं।

4 P.M.

मैं कहता हूं कि यह नामुनासिब है। हिन्दुस्तानी कल्चर सोसायटी को डिक्शनरी का काम, यह क्या है। इसी सोसाइटी ने संविधान का हिन्दुस्तानी में तर्जुमा किया था। वह तर्जुमा किस काम का है, किस के काम आता है?

डा० एस० एन० सिंह (सारन पूर्व): किसी के नहीं, रद्दी की टोकरी में गया।

श्री टंडन: आप को मदद देना है तो किसी ऐसे को मदद दें जो यह काम कर सके। हिन्दुस्तानी कल्चर सोसायटी में कितने मेम्बर हैं, कौन कौन हैं? कहां उसका अधिवेशन हुआ, कितने आदमी उस अधिवेशन में आये?

डा० राम सुभग सिंह। बगदाद में।

श्री टंडन: यह खुली बात है कि हिन्दी साहित्य सम्मेलन किस प्रकार की संस्था है। बराबर उस के खुले अधिवेशन हो रहे हैं, हजारों की संख्या में आदमी आते हैं। उस का काम १७००-१८०० केन्द्रों में है। उसकी तो आप अवहेलना करें, और नागरी प्रचारिणी सभा की अवहेलना करें और इस तरह से यह डिक्शनरी बनावें, यह किस काम में आयेगी और किस काम की होगी।

مولانا آزاد: کیا آپ کو یاد نہیں آیا کہ ناگری پرچارنی سبھا کو اس کام کے لئے روپیہ دینا منظور کیا گیا ہے ؟

[Maulana Azad: Do you not remember that grant has been sanctioned to Nagri Pracharni Sabha for this work?]

श्री टंडन: हां, मैं जानता हूं।

مولانا آزاد: اس کو بھول گئے آپ -

[Maulana Azad: You have forgotten this.]

श्री टंडन: नहीं, भूल नहीं गया। आप ने हिन्दी साहित्य सम्मेलन को भी मदद दी है। वह मदद क्या है, इस पर मैं अभी आता हूं। आप ने मदद दी है, मगर यहां यह डिक्शनरी के काम का सवाल है कि आप इस काम को हिन्दी साहित्य सम्मेलन से करायें या नागरी प्रचारिणी सभा से करायें या इस हिन्दुस्तानी कल्चर सोसाइटी से करायें। आप ने जो मदद दी वह तो शब्द सागर के लिये थी। यह दूसरा काम है। आपके विभाग ने कहा है कि अंग्रेजी से हिन्दी में आक्सफोर्ड कनसाइज डिक्शनरी की तरह कोष बनाया जाय। उस के लिये हिन्दी साहित्य सम्मेलन में काम हुआ है। कोई आठ या दस अक्षर के शब्द बन भी चुके। उन्होंने आप के विभाग से रुपया मांगा। उस पर वह हजारों

रुपये खर्च कर रहा है। वह काम कर लेगा, अगर आप एक पैसा भी नहीं दें तो भी वह कर लेगा, क्योंकि उसका तो अपना भी स्रोत है। वह इस काम में लगा है। उसने शिक्षा विभाग को लिखा कि हम को डिक्शनरी बनाने के लिये रुपये दीजिये। विभाग ने कहा कि डिक्शनरी का काम मत उठाओ। मेरा अन्दाज है कि शिक्षा विभाग ने पहले ही फैसला कर लिया था कि हिन्दुस्तानी कल्चर सोसायटी को ६० हजार रुपया देंगे, सम्मेलन को विभाग ने लिख दिया कि तुम इस डिक्शनरी के काम को मत उठाओ। हिन्दी साहित्य सम्मेलन तो विभाग का दास नहीं है, वह काम कर रहा है। वह लगभग तीन साल से वैज्ञानिक कोष का काम भी कर रहा है। आप के छोटे छोटे कामों पर मैंने सुना है कि लाखों रुपये खर्च हुये। मैंने रिपोर्ट में पढ़ा है कि आपने १६ या २० हजार शब्द सायंटिफिक बनाये हैं। मेरा निवेदन है कि हिन्दी साहित्य सम्मेलन के तीन वैज्ञानिक कोष छप चुके हैं। पिछले चार पांच वर्षों में लगभग तीस हजार वैज्ञानिक शब्द उन के यहां बन चुके हैं। उनका तो इरादा था कि तीन चार लाख शब्दों तक का निर्माण हो, आप दस बीस हजार शब्दों की बात कर रहे हैं? श्री महा पंडित राहुल सांकृत्यायन की देख रेख में यह सब काम हुआ था। सम्मेलन के काम में हिन्दी के पंडित सम्मिलित रहते हैं, जो हिन्दी से परिचित हैं। और शिक्षा विभाग ने जो यह कोष का काम दिया है उसमें न जाने किन लोगों से काम होगा।

जो सच्चा काम हिन्दी का करने वाले हैं, उन को आप पकड़िये। जो हिन्दी का विरोध करके हिन्दुस्तानी नाम से काम कर रहे हैं, उनको सहारा न दीजिये। हिन्दुस्तानी कल्चर सोसाइटी को आपने सहारा दिया। वर्धा में भी हिन्दुस्तानी प्रचार सभा को आपने सहायता दी। उसको रुपया दिया है। जो वहां पर राष्ट्रभाषा प्रचार समिति है, बहुत पुरानी जो संस्था है, और जो हिन्दी भाषा का काम कर रही है, उसको आपने एक पैसा नहीं दिया।

डा० एन० बी० खरे : बहुत पोल खुली है।

श्री टंडन : अब जो आपने मदद दी है उस पर भी थोड़ा सा कहना चाहता हूं।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: How long does the hon. Member propose to take?

Shri Tandon: I expect, not more than two or three minutes.

श्री टंडन : जो रिपोर्ट आप की आई है उसमें संस्कृति या कल्चर के सम्बन्ध में आपने लिखा है :

"Organisations doing useful work in the field of culture".

जिन को आपने सहायता दी है वह कौन कौन हैं। आपने लिखा है :

"The following institutions have so far been paid grants-in-aid:

Shibli Academy, Azamgarh Rs. 60,000."

इस शिबली एकेडेमी ने कल्चर का क्या काम किया है, मैं नहीं जानता। मैं यह जानता हूं कि उन्होंने उर्दू में बहुत सी किताबें लिखाई हैं, आज नहीं, बहुत पहले की बात है। पुरानी संस्था है और उस संस्था के चलाने वाले मेरे एक दोस्त रहे हैं, वह कांग्रेस के साथ भी थे। उर्दू में कई अच्छी किताबें यह संस्था तैयार कर चुकी है यह मैं मानता हूं। मगर आज उसके बारे में यह कहना कि कोई खास कल्चर का काम कर रही है, यह मेरा निवेदन है ठीक नहीं है। आज कल हमारे देश में कल्चर के माने क्या हैं, भारतीय संस्कृति। मैं कल्चर के माने समझता हूं भारतीय संस्कृति इस्लामी तमद्दुन नहीं जो जिना का लफ्ज

[श्री टंडन]

था, जिसने हमारे देश में टुकड़े कराये, हमारे देश का विभाजन कराया और पाकिस्तान बनाया। इस्लामी तमद्दुन और हिन्दू तमद्दुन इन दोनों से हमें अलग चलना है। इस के लिये हमारे देश में शब्द चला हुआ है, भारतीय संस्कृति। भारतीय संस्कृति, यह शब्द हमारे यहां कल्चर के लिये है। यह आजमगढ़ के लोग क्या भारतीय संस्कृति का काम कर रहे हैं जो आप ने उन को ६० हजार रुपये की मदद दी ?

अब दूसरी संस्था कौन है जिसको आप ने मदद दी ?

"Anjuman-e-Taraqqi-e-Urdu (India) Aligarh 36,000"

मैं इस का विरोधी नहीं हूं कि उर्दू संस्थायें हों, लेकिन कोई अनुपात हो, कोई सेंस आफ प्रोपोर्शन हो। आप ने इस को बिल्कुल एक नई संस्था को यह मदद दी। पुरानी अंजुमन तरक्की ए उर्दू थी जो मौलाना अबुल हक़ के साथ पाकिस्तान चली गई, उसका यहां दिल्ली में केन्द्र था। मौलाना अबुल हक़ के साथ वह कुल चीज चली गई। उसके बजाय एक नई छोटी सी चीज चली है और उसको आपने ३६ हजार रुपये दिये। यह वही संस्था है जो उत्तर प्रदेश में चारों तरफ़ दस्तखत कराती है। कि उर्दू उत्तर प्रदेश में क्षेत्रीय भाषा बनाई जाय। यह जो उर्दू के विषय में नई बात चली है, जहां तक मुझे मालूम है इस संस्था का उस में हाथ है। खैर! मैं उस पर उस दिन कह चुका, इस वक्त ज्यादा नहीं कहना चाहता हूं मैं इस को बहुत गलत समझता हूं। इस तरह आज फिर वही तफरका डालना है, फिर वही साम्प्रदायिकता पैदा करना है। और इस की आड़ में फिर वही मुस्लिम लीगी दिमाग है कि जिस की वजह से इस्लामी तमद्दुन पर जोर दिया गया था। आज हमें एक मिली जुली कल्चर की चीज, मिली जुली संस्कृति बनाना है। उस संस्कृति को हिन्दु मुसलमानों को मिल कर मंजूर करना उचित है। उर्दू पढ़ने लिखने के मैं खिलाफ नहीं हूं। मैं उर्दू का प्रेमी हूं, मैं फारसी का प्रेमी हूं। अब भी मुझे फ़ुरसत मिलती है तो फारसी के कवि हाफिज को लेकर कभी बैठ जाता हूं। मुझे इस बात का शौक है। मगर फारसी का शौक होना और चीज है और हमारे देश में क्या भाषा चले, यह दूसरी बात है। हमारे देश में एक ही संस्कृति, भारतीय संस्कृति ही चल सकती है। उस संस्कृति का आधार हमारे देश की भाषा, हमारे देश की लिपि है। आज कोशिश करना कि देश में अरबी और फारसी का रस्मुल खत हम चलायें, मेरा ख्याल है कि यह नामुनासिब बात है। अपने निजी काम के लिये हम बरतें, लेकिन पबलिक तरीक़े से खुल्लमखुल्ला काम में लाना यह और बात है। अब तीसरे नम्बर पर है :

"Hindustani Prachar Sabha, Wardha ... 30,000

All-India Fine Arts & Crafts Society.

यह अब अलग बात है।

आगे है :

"The cases of the Hindi Sahitya Sammelan, Rama Krishna Mission Institute of Culture and Bhartiya Vidya Bhavan for grants are under consideration."

आप हंसिये मत। यह उस वक्त की बात है जब कि रिपोर्ट लिखी गई थी। उस वक्त यह सब जेरे गौर था। जो रिपोर्ट अब मेरे पास आई है उस में लिखा है कि हिन्दी साहित्य सम्मेलन को रुपया दिया गया।

हर साल दिया जाता है । छः सात साल से दिया जाता है । ४० हजार रुपया दिया गया है, वह बराबर दिया गया और आज कोई नई चीज यह नहीं है । तो यह हिन्दी साहित्य सम्मेलन की भी मदद इस में आई है । अब आप इस को देख लें कि यह रुपया किस हिसाब से दिया गया और यह साठ हजार रुपया हिन्दुस्तानी कल्चर सोसायटी को किस हिसाब से दिया गया ।

مولانا آزاد: سالانہ نہیں، لمپ سم ہے-

[**Maulana Azad:** Not annually. It is a lumpsum.]

श्री टंडन : २५ हजार रुपया सन् १९५१ में दिया गया । उसका क्या हुआ, कहां है, उसका क्या बना, अब तक हमें नहीं मालूम है ।

मैंने सुना है कि उसके भवन के लिये कुछ रुपया देने का प्रस्ताव है । यह हिन्दुस्तानी कल्चर सोसायटी को या ऐसी हिन्दुस्तानी सोसाइटी को रुपया देना क्या आज उचित है ? हिन्दी सोसाइटी को रुपया दीजिये । जो हिन्दुस्तानी का काम करने वाली संस्थायें हैं उनको आज आपकी इस तरह की सहायता देना .....

مولانا آزاد : ڈاکٹر راجندر پرشاد اس کے چیرمین ہیں اور ان کے کہنے سے یہ رقم دی گئی ہے -

Maulana Azad: Dr. Rajendra Prasad is its chairman and the money has been given on his request.]

श्री टंडन : इस वक्त मेरा कहना यह है कि आप को हिन्दी संस्थाओं की सिर्फ मदद ही नहीं बल्कि हिन्दी की बड़ी २ संस्थाओं को अपने साथ लेकर जैसे मैंने पहले कहा था आपको पचास, साठ लाख रुपया लगा कर हिन्दी के ग्रन्थों को दो, तीन वर्ष के अन्दर तैयार करना चाहिये । आप यह कर सकते हैं, शिक्षा विभाग कर सकता है । एक एक किताब के ऊपर आठ, दस हजार रुपया खर्च करें और आप देखेंगे कि कितनी किताबें निकल आती हैं । मैंने एक संस्था की ओर से अभी एक किताब फ़िज़ीकल कैमिस्टिरी के ऊपर लिखवाई है, बी० ए० के कोर्स की किताब है, किताब छप कर आगई है और मैं उसको शिक्षा विभाग के पास भिजवा दूंगा । आप गौर करें ।

एक किताब पर सात, आठ हजार रुपया खर्च किया जाय । जितने विषय हैं विज्ञान के उनके सम्बन्ध में बहुत जल्द आप दो साल के अन्दर ७०-८० अच्छी किताबें निकाल सकते हैं । यह चीज गैर मुमकिन नहीं है, लेकिन वह काम नहीं हो रहा है । स्कीम्स कुछ बन रही हैं, कुछ ऊंघते हुये से स्कीम बना रहे हैं और यह उम्मीद की जा रही है कि हिन्दी का काम चले । बस मैं और अधिक न कहूंगा । मेरा यह नम्र निवेदन है कि ज्यादा तेजी के साथ काम होना चाहिये । मैंने उस दिन भी सुझाव दिया था और आज भी देता हूं कि आपके शिक्षा विभाग की तरफ से यह उचित होगा अगर हिन्दी साहित्य सम्मेलन, नागरी प्रचारणी सभा और दक्षिण की हिन्दी प्रचार सभा जो दक्षिण में हिन्दी का काम कर रही है, इन तीनों संस्थाओं से सलाह करके आप एक ऐसे लोगों का बोर्ड बनायें जो हिन्दी का काम कर सकें, जो हिन्दी अच्छी तरह से जानते हों और उसकी गतिविधि से वाकिफ हों । आप उनको पूरा काम सुपुर्द करें, वह एक आटोनोमस बाडी हो, स्वतंत्र संस्था हो और तब आप देखियेगा कि कितनी अच्छी तरह से यह काम होता है । अगर यह असम्भव हो तो मैंने जैसे पहले कहा था यह शासन के सोचने की बात है कि एक अलग हिन्दी के लिये आप मिनिस्ट्री बनायें और वहां

[श्री टंडन]

ऐसे लोगों को रक्खें जो हिन्दी के काम में दत्तचित हो कर जुट जायेंगे और अपने साहस और परिश्रम से इसको इतना बढ़ा देंगे कि फिर हम को दस, ग्यारह वर्ष के बाद यह सोचना न पड़े कि हमारे समाज के कार्य का कोई अंश है जिसमें हिन्दी न चल सके। इस काम की आवश्यकता है। यही मेरा निवेदन है।

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: After the very sober, calm and reasoned speeches of Acharya Kripalani and Rajarshi Tandon, our task has been lightened to a large extent. The greatest defect in the present educational system is that it is still following the old bureaucratic, imperialistic pattern. I had been reading the report of Dr. Mudaliar's Committee on Secondary Education. The Government of India appointed that Commission to recommend changes in the system of secondary education, and Dr. Mudaliar has pointed out that the majority of the educational experts who appeared before that Commission said that the present system of education in India was wasteful, ineffective, bookish, stereotyped, and it was following the old rigid pattern. I think that that is the greatest condemnation of our system of education.

It is a matter of deep regret that in free India we have not yet been able to achieve anything towards the reorientation of our system of education. The British manufactured a system for creating clerks and giving some administrative jobs in the services. We are still continuing that old pattern, and there has been no reorientation of our educational system. It is a matter of great sorrow and profound regret that men after men have complained that there is growing indiscipline among the student community and that there is exhibition of intolerance in the great universities both in my part of India and also in other areas. But the real fault lies in the system. It does not cater to the real aptitudes of the pupils. It does not attempt to develop the basic qualities which would make the students useful citizens of a Republic. The over-stress of examination, the old stress of overcrowding and all the paraphernalia which disfigured the old educational system still continue. Frankly speaking, nothing has been done by the present Education Minister to reorient our educational system. There is no conscious effort and no evidence of an architect's mind, to introduce really radical changes. There is no attempt to develop among our young sections independence of thought or initiative in tackling the problems of society. Therefore, Acharya Kripalani's comment is justified to a large extent.

Now, what has happened in the case of secondary education? The Ministry of Education's latest report says that "the Secondary Education Commission submitted its report in August 1953 and it was published in September 1953". What has the hon. Minister done? The report says that "the Central Advisory Board of Education met in November 1953". What has the Board done? The Board has again appointed a Committee to examine the recommendations of the Secondary Education Commission. We do not know when this Committee will finish its labours and whether there is any hope that something will be done in the near future.

Another amazing thing is this. The hon. Minister has reported that "in co-operation with the Ford Foundation a team of four foreign and four Indian educationists has been deputed to make a detailed study of secondary education systems in India, Europe and the U.S.A.".

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: The team has not yet returned.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: First you had the report of the Commission: then you

had the Central Advisory Board's meeting; then a committee was appointed; and now a team of educationists has gone abroad. They are still touring perhaps!

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Education (Dr. M. M. Das): They have come back.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: I am glad they have come back.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: The report says they have not come back.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: It says that "the team has completed its study tour and is expected to return to India soon". I am happy to know that they have come back and at least the touring expenses are over. But that is not the way to tackle education. We do not know when they came back; what is their report; what are their recommendations. Possibly, there will be another committee set up to go into this team's report, and we shall go on in this merry circle once again. This is a depressing thing. We want the hon. Minister to be more energetic and take it up more seriously and not allow himself to be bogged by this kind of recommendations or reports of Committees and Commissions. We know what these Committees are. They are intended not to solve problems, but to shelve them. This is nothing but an attempt to shelve this important problem. What is the good of having your Five Year Plan and talking big? What is the good of saying that we will build up the morale of the nation in the present crisis, unless we educate the people? India got freedom not because we wanted to fight another nation on racial grounds. We wanted freedom because India has something to give. The greatest fighter for India's liberation was Shri Arobindo Ghosh. He said that we are fighting for India's freedom because India's message has not yet been delivered, India's last word has not yet been spoken and India's mission has not yet been fulfilled in the world. We have got something to give to the world. That is the purpose for which India lives. India shall live but must live for that purpose. That would never be achieved unless you reorient the educational system in tune with the culture, the heritage and the Dharma of the nation. Dharma is not religion. It is national righteousness, the tradition, the deep seated culture. That should be brought into our plan and our entire educational system remodelled on that basis.

Few years, ago, when I was in Calcutta, there was a great upheaval in the University of Calcutta as regards the Commerce students. I was appointed by the Chancellor of the University as the Chairman of a Commission to recommend the reorganisation of commercial education. As the Chairman of that Commission, I had been to different universities I went back to my old University of London, went to Birmingham, and went to visit the commercial colleges in Paris. I was amazed to find the tremendous improvement they have made in the commercial curriculum. No student is granted a B.Com. degree in the Birmingham University unless the student actually works in a slum or factory area for three months every year. Then, he has to submit a thesis. That is examined and on that he gets his degree. When I was discussing the matter with the Dean of the Faculty of Commerce in the Birmingham University,—all the professors also sat with us—they said, this is what we are doing and that has led to great results. They said that as a matter of fact, every factory, every commercial house in and around Birmingham, both in the Midlands and in the North of England, takes Birmingham Commerce graduates. He asked, why don't you do that in your country? I told the Dean that that was impossible. He asked me the reason. I said, your total number of students is 350 whereas in the Calcutta University the number is nearly 14,000. Is it not really deluding ourselves, deluding the students,

[Shri N. C. Chatterjee]

and deluding the country to say that we are giving commercial education without the necessary resources, without establishing contact between the universities and the great commercial firms? Something practical should be done. This would tackle to a large extent the problem of middle class unemployment which is killing a good bit of our society.

I must draw the attention of the hon. Education Minister to one thing. I am fully at one with Shri Tandon in what he has said. I deplore greatly what the Education Ministry has done in its step-motherly attitude towards Hindi. It is quite right that Maulana Azad should intervene and say that he has sanctioned Rs. 1,00,000 to the Nagari Pracharini Sabha for preparing a Hindi dictionary. I cannot understand why, if you give Rs. 1 lakh to the Nagari Pracharini Sabha for preparing a Hindi dictionary, you should give another society a sum of Rs. 60,000 for preparing a concise dictionary.

सेठ गोविन्द दास : यह दूसरी चीज़ है, यह चीज नहीं है ।

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: I know: for preparing a concise dictionary. I think it is entirely wrong. As a matter of fact, organisations like the Hindi Sahitya Sammelan and Nagari Pracharini Sabha have been doing this kind of work. If they are capable, better fitted and qualified to produce a bigger dictionary, can't they produce a smaller dictionary? If you can entrust them with the job of producing a bigger dictionary, what is the point in asking another organisation to produce a smaller dictionary. If you think they are the real men who are dealing with this kind of work, the work of editing a Concise Dictionary should have been given to them.

There is one other thing which is very important, specially for us, having regard to the trouble in Calcutta. It is high time that the Central Government and the Education Ministry should give a directive that adequate steps should be taken to raise the salaries of teachers. You can never reform education unless you do something to improve the lot of the teachers. You know there was tremendous trouble in Calcutta as to the pay of the teachers. Ultimately, the Government had to sanction something. The main difficulty was lack of funds and other troubles. Many people have condemned the teachers for resorting to direct action and for doing certain things. It was pointed out by the teachers, and it was admitted both by the Government and by the legislators, that some of the teachers were paid less than even the peons or jemadars. Therefore, how can we expect any system of education to be effective unless and until you give decent living wages to the teachers?

I want to refer to one other important matter. I want both the hon. Minister and his colleagues and also Shri Tandon to listen to me. In the State of Bihar, a certain area in the District of Manbhum is predominantly Bengali speaking. As a matter of fact, the Census of 1931 showed that in the Sadar Sub-division of Manbhum, 87 per cent. was Bengali speaking. There are also other Bengali speaking areas in that State. I am not here at all raising the question of the reorganisation of the boundaries or the rectification of the frontiers. That would be dealt with by the Commission which has been appointed by the Government. What is now happening in that part of the country to the language of the minorities? The Bengali language is being ruthlessly suppressed. Members of Parliament and the legislature are being prosecuted and persecuted simply because they are exercising their fundamental right and because they are saying "do not suppress our Bengali language and culture". A Member of this House, Shri Bhajahari Mahata has been sentenced to imprisonment for one year and a fine has

been imposed because he sang this song. I have got a copy of the song here:

"शुन बिहारी भाई,
तोरा राखते नारबि डांग देखाइ ।
तोरा आपन तरे भेद बाड़ालि
बांग्ला भाषाय दिलि छाइ
भाइके भुले करलि बड़
बांग्ला बिहार बुद्धिटाइ ॥
बांगाली बिहारी सवाइ
एक भारतेर आपन भाइ
बांगाली के मारलि तबु
विष छड़ालि हिन्दी चाइ ॥
बांग्ला भाषार दावीते भाइ
कोनोभेदेर कथा नाइ
ए भारते भाइये भाइये
मातृभाषाय राज्य चाइ ॥

In that part of the country, there is a festivity which goes on from the end of Aghrayan to Basant Panchami among the tribal people and the Adivasis. There are thousands of people in the village areas, boys and girls,....

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: On a point of order, Sir, what has that to do with education?

Dr. M. M. Das: Education and language.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Minister must leave it to the Deputy-Speaker and not arrogate this to himself.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: The Parliamentary Secretary is a Bengali. That is the difficulty.

Shri Tyagi: He is a Bihari.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The point is about the language of the minorities; that is a fundamental right provided in the Constitution and it is sought to be denied according to the allegation. The hon. Member raises a point of order. It is open to the Government to enlighten the Chair.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: He is not the 'Government'. The 'Government' is the Education Minister. The Parliamentary Secretary is nothing.

مولانا آزاد : میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ
یہ سوال ایجوکیشن کے سلسلہ میں
اٹھایا جا سکتا ہے - کوئی وجہ نہیں
ہے کہ اسے روکا جائے -

[**Maulana Azad:** I think that the question can certainly be raised in respect of education. There is no reason why it should be stopped.]

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I agree, there is no point of order in this.

Dr. S. N. Sinha: On a point of information, Sir. I could not follow that Bengali song although I know Bengali. The people are Adivasis and the song is in Bengali. Do they sing in the same language as it has been read here?

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: The whole thing is distorted.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Why should hon. Members lose patience like this?

Every hon. Member is entitled to say what he wants to say. There is the hon. Minister here. There are other hon. Members also. If they want, they can contradict.

Dr. S. N. Sinha: On a point of information, Sir.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member is not giving way.

Dr. S. N. Sinha: I want to know whether what was read was the song of the Adivasis. They do not speak Bengali, they speak Hindi.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: It has been pointed out.... (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: What is the meaning of this?

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: I will give the translation:

> "Brothers of Bihar, kindly listen."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member will kindly look at me and speak.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: Yes, Sir, you are always in my mind. The translation of the Bengali song is as follows:

> "Brothers of Bihar, kindly listen. You cannot suppress us by 'dhang', *i.e.*, lathi or violence. Out of local interest, you have created cleavage between us and you are really pouring scorn on the Bengali language. You have forgotten the real interest of your own brothers and sisters (ourselves) and you are exaggerating the cleavage between the Bengalis and Biharis who are living together."

—I am looking at you, Sir. The song goes on:

> "Bengalis and Biharis, we are all sons and daughters of Mother India."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Including Madrasis!

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: Yes, Sir, the song sings—

> "You are suppressing Bengalis and assaulting them, and you are spreading poison in the name of reviving or making important Hindi. In our demand for keeping our Bengali language for our education and other things, there is no question of any hatred or any cleavage. In this motherland of ours, among brothers we want States to be constituted on the basis of our mother tongue."

For singing this song......

Dr. S. N. Sinha: The Adivasis do not speak this language and it is composed by the Bengalis. The language of the Adivasis is quite different. That is what I want to point out.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: But even if there is a single Bengali, he can sing that song.

Dr. S. N. Sinha: But he stated that the Adivasis sang it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If anybody sings that song, why should he be prosecuted? The complaint is that so far as linguistic minorities are concerned, in a particular area, their children are not allowed to have education in their mother tongue.

Shri Jajware (Santal Parganas *cum* Hazaribagh): That is wrong, Sir.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: Bengali is the language of thousands and thousands of people there. Bengali is the language of the Adivasis and other people there.

Shri Jajware: They were prosecuted for taking out an illegal procession without permission, not for the song.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: They were prosecuted for going against section 144?

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: There is no section 144. (*Interruption*). May I point out that after the Noakhali carnage, there was trouble there in Bihar, and some kind of Maintenance of Security Order was promulgated during that disturbance. That was finished long ago, but it had not been repealed. When the Tusu festival came this year, thousands of people in different parts of the district were going on singing this song and other songs.

Dr. S. N. Sinha: Not this song.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If any person has been convicted and sentenced to imprisonment of a year and fined, has there been an appeal on this matter by the person concerned?

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: Not yet.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is *sub judice* then. (*Interruptions*).

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: There has been no appeal preferred by Mr. Mahato, but in the case of one Member of the Legislative Assembly, a writ petition has been moved in the Supreme Court.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Regarding this matter?

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: No, not this song but a similar song.

Therefore, I am appealing that the hon. Members and the hon. Minister will take into account this feeling. When there is one minority, a substantial minority—call them Adivasis, call them tribal people, call them Bengalis—they have their own language and they want to have their folk songs, it is not right that there should be any attempt towards suppression of their native language.

Dr. S. N. Sinha: But they speak Hindi.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: Their fundamental right should not be in any way suppressed. It is their right to have it, and it is very desirable to give it full play.

You know, Sir, Shri Atulya Ghosh, who is the President of the West Bengal Provincial Congress, said here in the House the other day that this thing should stop. It is the duty of the Central Government and of the Education Minister to see that any language, especially a language like Bengali which has been put down at the top in the Eighth Schedule of the Constitution, which is the language in which Bankim Chandra composed his Ananda Math containing the Vande Mataram song, in which are enshrined the great gifts of Rabindranath Tagore, that language should not in any way be suppressed when people are wanting it to be retained. It has got nothing to do with the question of reorganisation of States. Dr. Mudaliar's Commission has unanimously recommended that the responsibility in this behalf should be shared both by the States and by the Centre, because it is a fundamental right which has been conferred on the citizens of India by our Constitution. It is our duty to see that their educational rights should be preserved and enshrined. They have a right to be educated in their own mother tongue, and it is the responsibility not merely of the States but of the Centre. The State may go wrong, or there may be people creating trouble in a particular State due to various factors, due to various local interests. I am, therefore, appealing to the Central Government and the Education Minister to see that this kind of suppression of a regional language is stopped.

Remember, Sir, that the head of the Lok Sevak Sangh who has been prosecuted and persecuted is Shri Atul Chandra Ghosh, a man who is revered in that part of the country, just as Acharya Vinobha Bhave is looked upon as one of the greatest disciples of Mahatma Gandhi.

Dr. S. N. Sinha: We call him Kaka Babu.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: You call him Kaka Babu, but you send him to jail and send him 135 miles in an open military truck from one jail to another. What I am saying is that that Kaka Babu is worshipped in that part of India. He is the greatest social service worker who has devoted his life in the service of the country. I know he has been recently released from jail because he has been suffering very badly. He had been suffering badly at the age of 75, but he was still taken from Purulia jail 135 miles in an open police truck to the Hazaribagh jail and kept there in detention in spite of his very bad health. Possibly his condition thereafter became very serious and he has been recently released, but his wife is still in jail, and there are hundreds of people still being prosecuted and persecuted.

[Shri N. C. Chatterjee]

Apart from the technical aspect of it, apart from the narrow legalistic aspect of it, I am appealing to the hon. Minister, Maulana Saheb, who lived in Bengal and who had close association with Bengali language, culture and literature, that he should see that these people should not be at all suppressed in any manner and denied their birthright of expressing themselves in their language and in having their education in their own mother tongue.

Some Hon. Members *rose*—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri N. B. Chowdhury.

डा० राम सुभग सिंह : हमको मौका नहीं मिला।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Hon. Members ought not to forget that I gave one full hour to the Congress Party at the instance of hon. Members here. I must give similar time to the Opposition.

Shri N. B. Chowdhury (Ghatal): The education Budget for 1954-55, in spite of the provision of a little more money, betrays the same lack of appreciation of the educational needs of India as it has so far done. Ever since we have come here, we have always been demanding provision of more money for education. In fact, in the country there is a movement that at least ten per cent. of the Central Budget should be set apart for education. But, today we see that although we are supposed to be in the midst of a Plan for development, the Government of India do not realise the urgent need of a programme of rapid expansion of education with a view to liquidating illiteracy, with a view to placing the educational institutions on a sound basis, and also with a view to improving the status and the living conditions of the teachers. Whatever may be the tall talk about the progress in this line, so far as we can see there is no justification for such a claim. If the rate of progress continues to be what it is today, then there is no hope of the fulfilment of the promise given in article 45 of the Constitution that within a period of ten years from the date of adoption of the Constitution there would be provision for free and compulsory education of all children up to the age of 14.

At the same time we find that the money voted in this House has not been spent. Look at the Budget of 1952-53. We see that while the provision in the Budget was for Rs. 369 lakhs under one Demand—Demand No. 20—the amount actually spent was only Rs. 313 lakhs. That means, there was a saving of Rs. 56 lakhs. So also, in the current year, we find that there was a provision of Rs. 4·88 crores in the Budget, but the Revised Estimate stands at Rs. 4·50 crores. So, there is going to be a saving of Rs. 38 lakhs. This is the saving expected, but it may even be more. If things continue in this way, there can be no scope for the fulfilment of the promise given in the Constitution.

We know that there is a scheme which has been adopted recently, according to which same thousands of teachers are going to be appointed throughout the country. But we find that even in this matter, there has been no fairness or justice, so far as the demands of the teachers are concerned. Reports are coming from West Bengal and Madras that while some new teachers are being appointed in schools, the old teachers who are supposed to be less qualified are being driven out. This scheme is intended to provide a certain amount of employment to the educated unemployed persons. But instead, it is going to replace some unemployed person by others. I submit that this should not be the way of implementing that scheme.

Apart from this, we also find that these teachers are to be appointed in primary and what are called basic schools. What are the distinguishing features of such types of basic schools? So far, we find that at some places, there is a little bit of some

spinning, some little hosiery work, and flag hoisting in a ceremonial fashion. That is all the special feature of these schools. This should not be so. Already criticism has been made that there is no agreed scheme or ideology for educational improvement in the country. So, we want that these teachers who are going to be appointed should do something real, so that the people can benefit from that.

While there is a large demand for rapid expansion of education, we find that the pay of officers in the Department is increasing. While it amounted to Rs. 5 lakhs two years ago, now it is nearly Rs. 7½ lakhs. Yet the amount earmarked for educational improvement is not spent fully. There are so many types of officers in the Ministry, such as secretary, deputy secretary, joint secretary, additional secretary, private secretary and so on. So many officers are there, but they are not in a position even to spend the money which is being voted by this House.

Next, I come to the appointment of commissions and committees. In the past, a large number of commissions were appointed, such as the Hunter Commission, the Sadler Commission, the Hartog Committee, the Sargent Committee etc. But, what did the Government do? After appointing these commissions and spending some thousands or lakhs of rupees on them, and thereby showing their goodwill to the people, ultimately Government used to put their reports into cold storage. Has the tradition changed at all, since the arrangement of August 1947? There was the Radhakrishnan Commission also, to go into university education. But in 1951, when the University Act was being passed in Bengal, they did not care to take into account or implement the recommendations of the Radhakrishnan Commission, which had been made public by that time. In the face of all these things, there is no justification for Government to come and say that their attitude has changed in this regard. We find that the same old tradition is continuing.

As regards the University Grants Commission, we find that there has been a considerable delay before it has been appointed. We must say on this occasion that sufficient money should be provided so that this Commission may do their work properly.

For the Visva Bharati University, in West Bengal, a sum of over Rs. 4 lakhs is being given, but in that University, we find that important subjects which are taught in the other universities are not taught. We want that this University which is associated with Rabindranath Tagore should be given money, and that it should be properly utilised. The students who go there for their education should get sufficient opportunities to receive education in important subjects, as in the Calcutta University.

Now I come to some of the detailed recommendations of the Secondary Education Commission. It has been stated by the Commission that they are making their recommendations realising the condition of India's resources, and that they would make only such recommendations as would be capable of being implemented by Government. They say:

> "We are anxious to see that our recommendations are of such a nature that they can be implemented."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. If hon. Members want to talk, I shall ask the hon. Member to stop for some time. I cannot go on with this kind of talk across the benches, when an hon. Member is making his speech.

Shri N. B. Chowdhury:. The Commission have also stated:

> "Many recommendations of previous Commissions have not been implemented. Many responsible people have therefore questioned the likelihood of any steps being taken to examine and implement the recommendations of this Commission."

[Shri N. B. Chowdhury]

We expect that this time at least, the recommendations of this Commission, particularly the ones relating to the living conditions of teachers would be implemented and not put in cold storage, as has been done so far.

Of course, it has been stated in the pamphlet supplied to us that they are going to implement in the course of the next year, some of the important recommendations. We do not know what those important recommendations are. Regarding the living conditions of teachers, the Commission observe:

> "...we were painfully impressed by the fact that the social status, the salaries and the general service conditions of teachers are far from satisfactory. In fact, our general impression is that on the whole their position today is even worse than it was in the past. It compares unfavourably not only with persons of similar qualifications in other professions, but also in many cases, with those of lower qualifications who are entrusted with less important and socially less significant duties..."

There is no time for me to go into concrete terms as to what their sufferings are. You know that only recently there had been some strikes, and the teachers asked for some increase in their pay and dearness allowance. But they were put in prison in hundreds. The same thing was done in Uttar Pradesh also last year.

Dr. M. M. Das: But my hon. friend should also inform the House that these are the teachers who have refused to sit for an examination and qualify themselves.

Shri N. B. Chowdhury: Here I am concerned with the living conditions of the teachers. It is the Commission appointed by Government that have stated in their report that this is the condition in which the teachers of the country are living, and that urgent and immediate steps should be taken to improve their conditions. I emphasise that the Central Government which shares the responsibility in this matter, as has been pointed out by the Commission in their report, cannot absolve themselves of their responsibilities so far as the cost of secondary education in the country is concerned. They must bear their share of it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. Once again, this talk has started. Hon. Members are talking in a group there. I really take exception to this. Hon. Members who are sitting there in a group do not care for what is going on here, but are carrying on conversation among themselves. It is very wrong to do so. The moment I stop and ask the hon. Member to speak, the talk starts once again. Hon. Members there seem to have no respect to this House.

Shri N. B. Chowdhury: It has been stated in the report, that some sort of educational cess can be levied on industry and more pay may be given to these teachers in the schools. Professors in colleges should also get more. But what is it that we are finding at the Centre as well as in various States? There are provisions made of crores and crores of rupees for payment of compensation to the landlords and mill-owners, but when it comes to a question of improving the conditions of teachers, and making rapid expansion so far as the education of the country is concerned, we find that there is no money.

You can do it in various ways. But there is no time for me to go into that.

Now, I come to the question of language which has created a stir in this House. We know that Hindi has been accepted as the national language in the Constitution. There is no quarrel over that. But why should there be arrogance and intolerance towards other languages and the linguistic minorities?

Seth Govind Das: Where is it?

Shri N. B. Chowdhury: There is a safeguard as per articles 347 and 350 of the Constitution whereby if grievances regarding a language are brought to the notice of the President, the President can call upon the State to **declare that for** such such people for such and such purposes that language has to be recognised. It really pained me to see that when Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru was loudly attacking and denouncing communalists, here, in this House itself, persons belonging to his party were giving expression to communal thoughts, and that too in a blatant and shameless way. I would ask the Leader of the House to cure his party of such communalists. Here we already heard that an hon. Member of the House is imprisoned simply because he was connected with a struggle for his mother tongue.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. I am really sorry that the hon. Member, Mr. Chatterjee, referred to this matter. Then it was brought to my notice that a writ petition has been preferred on behalf of the person who is convicted and that it was pending before the Supreme Court. The matter is now *sub judice* and I would not have allowed that matter to be talked about in this House but for the fact that this came to my notice at a later stage. Hereafter there should be no more reference to that matter here because proceedings are going on before the Supreme Court. We do not know on what it has arisen. Let us await the judgment.

Shri N. B. Chowdhury: Yes, Sir. I was speaking in general terms with regard to the ideas and the policy of Government towards languages, and as to what they should be. Here is a pamphlet supplied to us. We agree with the proposition enunciated here that "there are major Indian languages besides Hindi, and care has to be taken to allay any suspicion that the development of Hindi may in any way prejudice the growth and development of these languages". We are for the propagation of Hindi, to make it a *Rashtra Bhasha*. At the same time, we should see that there is no intolerance towards other languages. There are so many other languages and in the Eighth Schedule to the Constitution 14 major languages have been listed. There are some languages much more developed than Hindi according to some. When the position is such that in India there are so many languages, hundreds of languages so to say, they should not adopt such a defiant attitude. Here was given one instance. I can quote so many instances. The other day, I got a bulletin of the Parliamentary Hindi Association; it is entitled *Raj Bhasha*. Here I must say something. We, Bengalis, understand the term '*Raj Bhasha*' to mean 'King's language', or the ruler's language.

Seth Govind Das: No, no. On a point of personal explanation, because it belongs to me. 'Raj Bhasha' means 'State language'. We have made Hindi the State language and, therefore, the name of the paper is *Raj Bhasha*.

Shri N. B. Chowdhury: That may be the interpretation of the hon. Member. So long we have known it as the King's language. That is what they used to understand by it in our part of the country. That is our interpretation.

Anyway, our point is that we should not only tolerate the other languages, but we have also to help other languages to develop.

You will kindly give me some more time because of the raging controversies.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No, no. One or two minutes were taken up for that. I have allowed those two minutes.

Shri N. B. Chowdhury: No, Sir. I think I have 17 minutes; I have taken only 10 minutes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am here to judge. The hon. Member started at 4-37. Now it is 4-55. He has taken 18 minutes.

Shri N. B. Chowdhury: No, Sir.

Then I come to the question of the Scheduled Castes. You are giving scholarships. That is good. But what I find in the countryside is that the children belonging to the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes cannot go up to the secondary stage. You give help only to those who go for higher studies in the University. So there should be some provision made for payment of examination fees or payment towards purchase of books, so far as the Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribe candidates are concerned. Then there is the cost of education. Tuition fees have increased, So many times the cost of books has increased. So in general there has been an increase in the expenditure so far as education is concerned. So, the State has to give more and more aid to educational institutions; otherwise, there can be no expansion of educational schemes and there can be no progress of education. While you cannot give grants to these institutions, we find that certain pet institutions—public schools—are being given lavish grants. More than Rs. 7 lakhs have been given to the Lawrence Schools. Lovedale and Sanawar. There are other types of grants also. So far as these schools are concerned, are you going to create leaders in schools like Harrow and Eton, which are meant for creating leaders to dominate over other people? We do not think that this sort of discrimination should continue. All sorts of people should be allowed to come together; they should have equal opportunity for education.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member must stop.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh.

Seth Govind Das *rose*—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am coming to other hon. Members.

डा० राम सुभग सिंह : उपसभापति महोदय, अभी श्री एन० सी० चटर्जी ने कहा कि मानभूमि सबडिवीज़न में . . . .

Some Hon. Members *rose*—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Hon. Members may stand up and sit down as often as they want. But they must catch my eye.

Pandit S. C. Mishra: Not the outer eye; it is always the inner eye.

डा० राम सुभग सिंह : अभी श्री एन० सी० चटर्जी ने कहा कि मानभूमि जिले में बंगला बोलने वालों का बहुमत है और उन्होंने अपने प्रमाण के लिये मानभूमि सदर सब डिविजन का हवाला दिया, लेकिन मैं पूछना चाहता हूं कि मानभूमि सदर के अलावा और जितने सब डिवीज़न हैं उनके बारे में उन्होंने या पार्लियामेंटरी सेक्रेटरी ने कभी यह जानने को चेष्टा की कि वहां हिन्दी कितनी बोली जाती है । इस तरह से जानबूझ कर हिन्दी बोलने वाले इतने बड़े भाग की उपेक्षा करना न तो उनको उचित था और न ही हमारे पार्लियामेंटरी सेक्रेटरी को । इन्हीं अड़ंगों के कारण बंगाल बांटा गया और आज भी सरकार की ओर से और जो हिन्दी के विरोधी हैं उनकी ओर से ऐसी चेष्टा की जाती है और यह दिखलाने की कोशिश की जाती है कि वहां बंगला बोलने वालों का बहुमत है । उनको पता होना चाहिये कि वास्तविकता यह है कि सम्पूर्ण मानभूमि में अगर देखा जाय तो मुश्किल से दस प्रतिशत बंगला वाले होंगे । मैं इस सम्बन्ध में ज्यादा नहीं कहना चाहता, लेकिन चाहता हूं कि पार्लियामेंटरी सेक्रेटरी और उनकी मिनिस्ट्री को यह समझना चाहिय कि उनका क्या दायित्व है । उनका कर्तव्य बच्चों और लड़कों को शिक्षित बनाना है और यह जानने के लिये कि देश में कितने किस भाषा के बोलने वाले हैं और स्टेट्स का रिआर्गेनाइजेशन इस वक्त कैसे किया

जाय इसके लिये तो स्टेट्स रिआर्गेनाइज़ेशन कमीशन बना दिया गया है, वह डिटेल में जायगा । यदि इनको वहां के लोगों के बारे में ज्यादा प्रेम और तजुर्बा है तो मैं यह उचित समझता कि शिक्षा मंत्रालय की ओर से वहां मानभूमि में बंगला का ही स्कूल खोल दिया गया होता । पर ऐसा नहीं हुआ है । इसलिये मेरा चार्ज एजूकेशन मिनिस्ट्री पर यह है कि उन्होंने आज तक हिन्दुस्तान के लोगों को शिक्षित बनाने के लिये कोई उचित व्यवस्था नहीं की ।

आज सन् १९४६ से १९५४ तक आठ वर्ष हो रहे हैं, लेकिन हमारे शिक्षा मंत्रालय की शिक्षा सम्बन्धी नीति अभी तक निर्धारित नहीं की जा सकी । आज एक स्वर से यह कुछ बंगाली सदस्य यह आवाज उठाते हैं कि मानभूमि को बंगाल में मिलाना चाहिये । पर जिस चिज की आवश्यकता है जो विषय है आज के डिस्कशन का उस पर बातचीत कीजिये यह नहीं कि असलियत को छिपाने के लिये और अपनी कमजोरी को छिपाने के लिये आप हिन्दू सभा से मिल जांय और उनके मुआफ़िक बात करने लगें । अब मैं मानभूमि के बारे में आता हूं......

Dr. M. M. Das: Why is the hon. Member referring to me? I have not uttered more than two words.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: I am charging you both.

Dr. M. M. Das: You are impinging many things upon me.

श्री बी० जी० देशपांडे : चटर्जी का नाम लेकर आप क्यों इररेलेवेंट बोलते हैं ?

डा० राम सुभग सिंह : जैसा मैं ने कहा आठ वर्ष हो गये लेकिन अभी तक इस मिनिस्ट्री द्वारा कोई सिद्धान्त नहीं स्थिर किया जा सका कि प्राइमरी एजूकेशन किस तरह से होनी चाहिये, किस तरह से सेकेन्डरी एजूकेशन होनी चाहिये । और किस तरह से युनिवरसिटी एजूकेशन होनी चाहिये, लेकिन यह निश्चय किया जा सका कि डाक्टर राजन्द्र प्रसाद के कहने पर हिन्दुस्तानी कलचर सोसाइटी को ग्रान्ट दी जाय, मैं नहीं चाहता कि प्रेसीडेंट का नाम यहां पर लिया जाय, लेकिन अभी शिक्षा मंत्री ने उनका नाम यहां ला दिया और कहा कि उनके कहने पर हिन्दुस्तानी प्रचार सभा को ३६ हजार रुपया दिया गया, तो क्या शिक्षा मंत्रालय का यही काम है कि कोई भी बड़ा आदमी आकर कह दे तो वह बिना समझे दे दें । डाक्टर राजेन्द्र प्रसाद के कहने पर हिन्दुस्तानी प्रचार सभा को दे दिया जाय, मानभूमि को श्री एन० सी० चटर्जी के कहने पर दे दिया जाय और डाक्टर जाकिर हुसैन के कहने पर जामिया मिलिया को ग्रान्ट देदी जाय । मैं एजूकेशन मिनिस्ट्री की इस नीति का घोर विरोधी हूं और मैं चाहता हूं कि एजूकेशन मिनिस्ट्री अपनी इस नीति को बदले और जनता के हित में जो उचित हो वह करे ।

Dr. M. M. Das: Does the hon. Member mean......

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The Parliamentary Secretary, evidently does not realise that these interruptions do not get through any explanation. I am willing to give an opportunity to the hon. Minister and his Parliamentary Secretary also to explain the Government position. The Government position will never go unnoticed. I will allow ample time for it.

5 P.M.

डा० राम सुभग सिंह : इस तरह से मैं एक साफ आफर देता हूं कि यदि यहां पर किसी को मानभूमि की बात करनी है तो मैं सम्पूर्ण बिहार को कहता हूं, सब से पश्चिमी जिले में मेरा घर है, मेरी कान्स्टिट्युएन्सी है, सब बिहार ले लें, बंगाल में मिला लें, और सम्पूर्ण बिहार और बंगाल में जो भाषा चाहें रक्खें । लेकिन हिम्मत के साथ । आज

[डा० राम सुभग सिंह]

अगर मैं भी यह मांग रक्खूं कि बड़ा बाजार में भोजपुरी बोलने वाले आदमी हैं, उसे बिहार में मिलाओ, दार्जिलिंग बिहार में मिलाओ, तो आप क्या यह आफर मानेंगे ? या तो सम्पूर्ण बिहार मिला लें, व्यवस्था के आधार पर, बेकार में नहीं, या बड़ा बाजार और दार्जीलिंग, दोनों जो जिले हैं, जहां हिन्दी बोली जाती है, उन को बिहार में मिला दें। मैं कहता हूं कि गवर्नमेंट और हिन्दू महासभा दोनों यूनाइट हो जाते हैं हिन्दी को दबाने के सवाल में। आज नहीं प्राचीन काल में बिहार में अंगरेज सरकार ने जो हिन्दी का प्रचार किया वह बड़ी कठिनाई से किया। यहां आप के सामने उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह यूनाइट हो जाते हैं और यही नहीं सारे देश में आज यह बात चल रही है, एक एक तबके को उभारा जा रहा है राष्ट्र भाषा के खिलाफ। मैं इस नीति की निंदा करता हूं। और इसी लिये कहता हूं कि जो बजट में १४ करोड़ २६ लाख रुपये की व्यवस्था है, जो मांग आज सदन के सामने है, उसे आप मत स्वीकार कीजिये। आज जो रवैया नेताओं में, डा० मनमोहन साहब या चैटर्जी साहब की ओर से, देखता हूं, उस के कारण मैं कहता हूं कि इस में जो साइन्टिफिक सब्जेक्ट्स के लिये या जो टेकनिकल एजूकेशन के लिये मांग है उस को तो सदन जरूर मंजूर करे, लेकिन और जो बड़े बड़े लोगों के कहने पर धन दिया जाता है, उस को न देना चाहिये। आज करों के मारे जनता तबाह हो रही है, एक एक आदमी को खर्चे के अभाव में अच्छे अच्छे कपड़े नहीं मिलते, साबुन नहीं मिलता, आज लो कास्ट हाउसिंग की नुमाइश की जाती है, लेकिन सीमेन्ट पर टैक्स लगाया जाता है, जूते पर टैक्स लगाया जाता है, उस समय अर्थ मंत्री महोदय यह देखें कि टेकनिकल एजूकेशन और साइन्टिफिक एजूकेशन जिस की देश की पंच वर्षीय योजना को चलाने के लिये आवश्यकता है, उस को इस १४ करोड़ की डिमान्ड को क्यों नहीं दे देते ? आप की बड़ी बड़ी नदी घाटी योजनायें हैं, और और भी काम हैं, राष्ट्रीय सेवा का काम है, उस में आप यह १४ करोड़ रुपया लगा दीजिये। कहा जाता है कि कल्चर में दस लाख रुपये का प्राविजन है, आप कल्चर की बात करते हैं, कौन सा कल्चर का काम आप करते हैं ? लोगों को खाने को नहीं मिलता, यहां पर कल्चर की बात होती है, जितने आदमी हिन्दुस्तान में हैं उन में से ८० फी सदी आदमियों को खाने के लिये नहीं मिलता है आप डान्सिग ऐकेडमी खोलते हैं। हमारे देश में शब्द भी आते हैं इटली से। क्या हिन्दुस्तान में शब्द नहीं हैं ? आप तामिल से क्यों नहीं लेते ? आप मलयालम से क्यों नहीं लेते ? ऐकेडमी के लिये संगम शब्द तामिल में है, लेकिन आप ढूंढ कर बाहर से चीज ले आते हैं और ठूंस ठूंस कर हिन्दी में भरते हैं कहीं आप अरबी से लाये, कहीं इटली से लाये। बाहर जा कर शब्द लाने की मनोवृत्ति यहां देखी जाती है। यह उचित नहीं है।

इस के साथ साथ इस ग्रान्ट के बारे में अभी कुछ लोगों ने कहा कि किन किन को ग्रान्ट्स दी गई हैं। मैं तो कहता हूं कि इस मिनिस्ट्री को ऐबालिश कर दीजिये अगर इस तरह से काम किया जाता है। इस कार्य के लिये एक कमिशन रक्खा जाय और कमिशन ग्रान्ट्स स्वीकार करे। कमिशन जा कर देश भर में तय करे कि किस किस को ग्रान्ट दी जाय।

आज आप इस बजट को देखिये। मैं तो इस को देख कर हैरत में पड़ जाता हूं कि मन्दिर, मस्जिद, कब्रिस्तान बनाने के लिये तीन चार लाख रुपये की व्यवस्था है। मैं कहता हूं कि डाक्टर मन मोहन दास

बतायें कि हिन्दुस्तान का ऐसा कौन सा शहर है, बंगाल के मानभूम में स्टूडेन्ट्स के लिये कितने होस्टल हैं ? बतावें कि हिन्दुस्तान में कौन ऐसा जिला है जिस जिले में लड़कों के, पढ़ने वाले लड़कों के रहने के लिये, होस्टेल हैं ? लड़के परेशान हो रहे हैं, उन को हाई स्कूलों में जगह नहीं मिलती और यहां पर, केवल दिल्ली में, एक लाख दस हजार रुपया टूम्बस पर लगाया जा रहा है । मैं कहता हूं कि इतने रुपये से आप दिल्ली युनिवर्सिटी में लड़कों के लिये एक होस्टल क्यों नहीं बनवा देते ? इसी तरह से आप कलकत्ते में होस्टल बनवाइये, मद्रास मे बनवाइये, लखनऊ में बनवाइये । आज आप बंगाल में मानभूम ले जाने की इच्छा करते हैं लेकिन बंगाल वालों की आप व्यवस्था नहीं कर पाते । कलकत्ते में रोज गोली चलती है, वहां टीचर्स की दुर्दशा हो रही है, वहां के स्टूडेन्ट्स की जो दुर्दशा हो रही है, लखनऊ में अभी आपने देखा कि हालत कितनी नाजुक थी, उस की व्यवस्था आप कर नहीं पाते और मानभूम मिलाना चाहते हैं बंगाल में । मैं चाहूंगा कि शिक्षा विभाग अपनी नीति दुरुस्त करे और कोई भी अपव्यय न होने दें ।

आज प्राइमरी एजूकेशन की क्या हालत है ? आज डिस्ट्रिक्ट बोर्ड से ले कर युनिवर्सिटी एजूकेशन तक किसी भी जगह निश्चित व्यवस्था नहीं है । आप निश्चय कीजिये कि कैसे आपकी प्राइमरी एजूकेशन हो, कैसे सेकेन्डरी एजूकेशन हो, लिटररी वर्कशाप खोले जा रहे हैं, फोर्ड फाउन्डेशन आ कर हमें पालिसी बताता है । सेकेन्ड्री एजूकेशन कमिशन ने जो रिकमेन्डेशन्स पेश किये आप के सामने १९५३ में उन रिकमेन्डेशन्स को सेबोटेज करने के लिये फोर्ड फाउन्डेशन ने हमारे ऊपर एक कमेटी लाद दी जो विदेशों के दौरे पर है ।

مولانا آزاد : کتنا غلط آپ کہہ رہے ھیں -

[**Maulana Azad:** What you are saying is wrong.]

डा० राम सुभग सिंह : मैं दुरुस्त कर लूंगा । लेकिन मुझे तकलीफ़ यह है कि फोर्ड फाउन्डेशन हमारे ऊपर अपनी नीति लाद रहा है ।

مولانا آزاد : آپ غلط کہہ رہے ھیں -

[**Maulana Azad:** This is wrnog.]

डा० राम सुभग सिंह : रिपोर्ट में है, मैं पढ़ देता हूं ।

مولانا آزاد : میں بتلا دونگا - آپ کہے جایے -

[**Maulana Azad:** I will explain, you carry on.]

डा० राम सुभग सिंह : यह तो सब लिखा हुआ है, दूसरी कमेटी फोर्ड फाउन्डेशन के सहयोग से भेज दी गई यू० एस० ए० और ब्रिटेन का दौरा करने के लिये, उस में चार हिन्दुस्तानी हैं और चार विदेशी । वह लोग जो रिपोर्ट देंगे उस के अनुकूल, यह जो सेकेन्ड्री एजूकेशन कमिशन की रिपोर्ट आई है, उस को बनाया जायगा । हम को मौलाना साहब में पूरा इत्मीनान है, उन में हम को पूरा विश्वास है, लेकिन एक आदमी के विश्वास का मामला दूसरा है और काम का मामला दूसरा है । जब हम कार्य क्षेत्र की ओर बढ़ते हैं तो मैं अपने बिहार में देखता हूं, यहां पर होस्टलों में देखता हूं, कि जहां तक इन ग्रान्ट्स के बारे में और स्कालर्शिप्स का सवाल है, हिन्दुस्तान में कम से कम पचास फीसदी लोग ऐसे हैं, जैसा कि आचार्य कृपालानी जी ने कहा था और दूसरे दूसरे लोगों ने कहा

[डा० राम सुभग सिंह]

था, जिन को भर पेट खाना नहीं मिलता है, किताब खरीदने को रुपया नहीं है, या कागज के लिये रुपया नहीं है, और यहां आप दस दस लाख, पंद्रह पंद्रह लाख रुपया कल्चरल एकेडमी में खर्च कर रहे हैं। मैं तो कहता हूं कि ४ करोड़ तो कम से कम आप गरीब स्टूडेन्ट्स को दे दें, जो गरीब हैं, उन को आप यह दे दें। यहां पर जो टेकनिकल एजूकेशन और साइन्टिफ़िक एजूकेशन पर आप खर्च करें उस के बाद जो बच रहे वह आप ऐसे लोगों को बांट दीजिये। बड़े बड़े मन्दिरों और मस्जिदों के संवरवाने को जो कि आज से हजारों साल पहले बनी थीं, आवश्यकता नहीं है। आज जब कि जनता को खाने को नहीं मिलता, जो कपड़े के लिये तरसती है, स्कूलों में बच्चे फीस की कमी के कारण स्कूल छोड़ छोड़ कर जा रहे हैं, मैं कहता हूं कि आप ऐसे स्कूलों को फ्री ग्रान्ट्स दीजिये, कोई बड़ा आदमी उन के लिये रिकमेन्डेशन करे, यह नहीं, लेकिन सोच समझ कर, ऐसे ऐसे इन्स्टिट्यूशन्स हैं जिन को मदद देने की जरूरत है, उन को मदद दे कर हमें उठाना है, जिन के लिये यहां चर्चा की गई।

इस के साथ पब्लिक स्कूल के लिये एक लाख रुपये के स्कालरशिप्स देने की व्यवस्था की गई है। लेकिन यह एक लाख रुपया दाल में नमक के बराबर भी नहीं है। इस को हम को एक दो करोड़ के रूप में दे कर इन स्कूलों की तरक्की करनी चाहिये। और केवल पब्लिक स्कूलों को ही नहीं, वहां गरीब नहीं जाते हैं, बल्कि और स्कूलों को दे कर भी, और ज्यादा स्कीमें चला कर, उन को बढ़ाने की व्यवस्था करनी चाहिये।

इस के साथ साथ अब नामों के सवाल है। लिट्रेरी वर्कशाप्स खोली जा रही हैं, यहां पर ऐसे ऐसे नाम रखने चाहियें जिन को कि यहां की जनता समझ सके।

उस चीज को तो मैं समझ सकता हूं। आप देश के किसी नाम को प्रश्रय दीजिये। ऐसा नाम दीजिये जैसा कि विनोबा जी ने दिया है जिसे हर एक आदमी समझ सकता है। गांधी जी ने सत्याग्रह का नाम दिया, उसको हर कोई समझ सकता है। ऐसा नाम देना चाहिए था जिसको सब लोगों को समझने में सुविधा हो। लेकिन नाम दिया गया है लिटरेरी वर्कशाप। यह चार जगह खोले गये हैं। एक अलीपुर (दिल्ली) में खोला गया है। और तीन अन्य जगहों में खोले गये हैं। इसमें आता है न्यो लिटरेट्योर्स। यह भी कोई समझ सकेगा। कितना लाखों रुपया इसमें लगाया गया है। तो मैं चाहूंगा कि ऐसे कामों में ज्यादा रुपया न लगाया जाय। पता नहीं चलता कि इन लोगों ने कहां शिक्षा पायी है और उनकी शिक्षा का क्या प्रयोग हो रहा है।

डिक्शनरी वगैरह के बारे में कहा ही जा चुका है। हिन्दुस्तानी सभा के बारे में जो बहुत ज्यादा सरगर्मी है उसका ट्रांसलेशन का नमूना यह है कि वह चीफ जस्टिस को कहते हैं सर जज, चीफ मिनिस्टर को कहते हैं सर वजीर, एग्रेशन को कहते हैं जबरियाब आदि। अगर ऐसे माने किये जायेंगे तो यह किसी की भी समझ में नहीं आयेंगे। तो मैं यह चाहूंगा कि ऐसे संगठनों को जिनका कोई ठिकाना नहीं है उनको सहायता नहीं देनी चाहिए और गरीबों को सहायता देनी चाहिए।

सेठ गोविन्द दास : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय सर्वप्रथम मैं यह कह देना चाहता हूं कि इस समय इस देश में मैं जिन की सब से ज्यादा इज्जत करता हूं वे चार महानुभाव हैं, हमारे राष्ट्रपति डाक्टर राजेन्द्र प्रसाद जी, पंडित जवाहरलाल जी, राजर्षि पुरुषोत्तम दास जी

टंडन ग्रौर मौलाना ग्रबुलकलाम ग्राजाद साहब । यह बात मैं इसलिए कह रहा हूं कि जिस से जो कुछ मैं कहने वाला हूं उस में कोई गलतफहमी न हो । मौलाना साहब के प्रति बहुत बड़ी इज्जत रखते हुए भी मुझे यह कहना पड़ता है कि उन के कारण हो, या उन के दूसरे मंत्रियों के कारण हो, या उन के समूचे विभाग के कारण हो, ग्राज शिक्षा विभाग ग्रभारतीय है, ग्रौर उस के ग्रभारतीय होने का दोष चाहे मौलाना साहब पर न हो, लेकिन जब इतिहास लिखा जायगा तो उस की सारी जिम्मेदारी मौलाना साहब के ऊपर रहने वाली है । सब से पहली बात हमें यह सोचना है कि उस के ग्रभारतीय होने का कारण क्या है । उस के ग्रभारतीय होने के दो प्रधान कारण हैं । पहला कारण यह है कि वहां पर ग्रंग्रेजी की बू ग्रारम्भ से ग्रन्त तक भरी हुई है ग्रौर दूसरा यह कि ग्रंग्रेजी के साथ वहां पर उर्दू भी परिप्लावित है । मैं कह देना चाहता हूं कि मैं ग्रंग्रेजी या उर्दू भाषाग्रों का कोई विरोधी नहीं हूं ।

ग्राचार्य कृपालानी : सभी ऐसा कहते हैं ।

सेठ गोविन्द दास : मैं ने जो कुछ लिखा है उस में से कई चीजों को मैं ने ग्रंग्रेजी में भी लिखने का प्रत्यन किया है । मैं ग्रपने कई ग्रन्थों का ग्रनुवाद ग्रंग्रेजी में करा रहा हूं । जहां तक उर्दू का सम्बन्ध है मैं ने ग्रपने कई नाटकों में उर्दू का खूब ग्रच्छी तरह से प्रयोग किया है । लेकिन भाषाग्रों का विरोधी न होना एक बात है ग्रौर कौन भाषा किस स्थान पर रहनी चाहिए यह दूसरी बात है । ग्रंग्रेजी राज्य हमारे देश में कुछ ऐसे समुदाय को छोड़ गया है कि जिस को मैं ने एक विशेष नाम दिया है । उस समाज को मैं मेकाले पुत्रों का समाज नाम देता हूं ।

डा० एन० बी० खरे : जरखी मेकाले ।

सेठ गोविन्द दास : जहां देखिये वहां ग्रंग्रेजी का बोलबाला । ग्रंग्रेजी यहां रखनी चाहिए, ग्रंग्रेजी वहां रखनी चाहिए, ग्रंग्रेजी सब जगह रखनी चाहिए यह समाज यह चाहता है । [इसीलिए मैं ने उस समाज का नाम मेकाले पुत्रों का समाज रखा है ।

एक माननीय सदस्य : यह नाम ग्रच्छा नहीं है इस को बदल दीजिये ।

सेठ गोविन्द दास : फिर उर्दू इस देश में ग्रामफहम जबान नहीं हो सकती ।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Is it necessary to use such expressions as "Maculay's son" if one is interested in a particular language?

सेठ गोविन्द दास : क्योंकि यहां पर ग्रंग्रेजी की नींव मेकाले साहब ने डाली थी ग्रौर इस बात का प्रयत्न किया था.......

Shri M. D. Joshi (Ratnagiri South): May I ask whether it is good parliamentary practice to call those who like English as "Macaulay's sons"?

Seth Govind Das: If it is unparliamentary, I am ready to take it back.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is very indecent to use such an expression and I do not think it fits in with the dignity of the House. A Telugu man will have to be given some name and a Tamil man some other name, and so on. After all, each one has got his own father.

सेठ गोविन्द दास : मैं मेकाले के ग्रनुयायी नाम दे दूंगा ।

Acharya Kripalani: He is talking of the spiritual parent.

Shri Sarangadhar Das: It is not to be taken literally.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I do not also mean to say literally.

सेठ गोविन्द दास : उर्दू के सम्बन्ध में मेरा यह निवेदन है कि वह इस देश की भाषा

[सेठ गोविन्द दास]

होते हुए भी देश के पृथककरण की जो भावना आयी द्विराष्ट्र सिद्धान्त का इस देश में जन्म हुआ और आगे चल कर पाकिस्तान बना, उस विषय की उर्दू भाषा इस देश में नींव रही है। मैं साम्प्रदायिक नहीं हूं। कुछ लोग यह कहते हैं कि यह सब साम्प्रदायिक भावनाओं से कहा जाता है। मैं आज तक किसी साम्प्रदायिक संस्था में नहीं रहा हूं। जब मैं गोरक्षा की बात कहता हूं तो कहा जाता है कि यह साम्प्रदायिक बात है, जब मैं हिन्दी की बात कहता हूं तब भी यह कहा जाता है कि यह बात साम्प्रदायिक है। मैं उन लोगों को साम्प्रदायिक कहता हूं जो भारतीय संस्कृति के विरुद्ध अंग्रेजी और उर्दू को इस देश में कायम रखने का प्रयत्न करते हैं। मैं यह मानता हूं कि जिन की मातृभाषा उर्दू है उन को उर्दू पढ़ने लिखने और बोलने का पूरा अधिकार होना चाहिए। पर यह मैं नहीं छिपाना चाहता कि अंग्रेजी और उर्दू भाषाओं की हिन्दी से स्पर्धा है। आज उत्तर प्रदेश में यह मांग की जा रही है कि उर्दू भी वहां की भाषा बनायी जाय। मैं इस को अंग्रेजी में "थिन एंड आफ दी वैज" कहता हूं। अगर आज उत्तर प्रदेश में इस प्रकार से उर्दू को मान्यता दी गयी तो आगे चलकर बिहार में यह प्रश्न उठेगा, मध्यभारत में उठेगा, राजस्थान में उठेगा, मध्य प्रदेश में उठेगा और हमारा जो आधे से अधिक देश हिन्दी भाषाभाषी है वहां पर यह प्रयत्न किया जायगा, जो प्रयत्न कि पहले किया गया था कि, दोनों लिपियां हों और दोनों भाषायें हों। पाकिस्तान बन जाने के बाद हम इस देश में हिन्दी भाषाभाषी क्षेत्रों में स्थान स्थान पर पाकिस्तान नहीं बनने देना चाहते।

प्रान्तीय भाषाओं के सम्बन्ध में भी अभी कुछ कहा गया है। मैं प्रान्तीय भाषाओं का सब से बड़ा समर्थक रहा हूं। जब मैं हिन्दी साहित्य सम्मेलन का सभापति था और मैं ने अहिन्दी भाषाभाषी प्रान्तों का दौरा किया था तब मैं ने इस बात को बहुत स्पष्ट किया था और अब भी मेरी यही राय है कि जिन प्रान्तों की भाषा हिन्दी नहीं है वहां पर शिक्षा का माध्यम प्रान्तीय भाषा हो, न्यायालयों में प्रान्तीय भाषा काम में लायी जाय, वहां की असेम्बली का काम प्रान्तीय भाषा में हो। प्रान्तीय भाषाओं और हिन्दी की कोई स्पर्द्धा नहीं है। अगर हम को इस देश में लोगों को शिक्षित बनाना है तो हम को जितना ध्यान हिन्दी की ओर देना चाहिए उतना ही ध्यान प्रान्तीय भाषाओं की ओर भी देना चाहिए। इसलिए यह कहना कि जो लोग यह कह रहे हैं कि हिन्दी को उस का उचित स्थान मिलना चाहिए वे प्रान्तीय भाषाओं के विरुद्ध हैं यह गलत बात है और इस से गलतफहमी फैलती है। मैं इस बारे में हिन्दी वालों को भी सचेत करना चाहता हूं हिन्दी भाषियों को जितना प्रेम हिन्दी भाषा से है उतना ही प्रेम प्रान्तीय भाषाओं से होना चाहिए। अगर हिन्दी राजभाषा बनी है तो वह इसलिए कि वह अधिक लोगों की भाषा है इसलिए नहीं कि हिन्दी में कोई खास सुरकाब का पर लगा है। यह जो बार बार कहा जाता है कि हिन्दी भाषाभाषी प्रान्तीय भाषाओं के विरुद्ध हैं गलत है। मैं प्रान्तीय भाषाओं का उतना ही समर्थक हूं जितना हिन्दी का।

हिन्दी का रूप क्या होना चाहिए इस सम्बन्ध में कोई बहुत मतभेद की आवश्यकता नहीं है। हमारे संविधान में इस बात को स्पष्ट कर दिया गया है कि हिन्दी में मूलतः हम को संस्कृत से शब्द लेने हैं। आज जो अंतर्राष्ट्रीय वैज्ञानिक शब्दावली कही जाती है, मैं आप से कहना चाहता हूं कि मैं तमाम दुनिया के देशों को देख कर आया हूं, अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय वैज्ञानिक शब्दावली के सदृश कोई चीज नहीं है।

अंग्रेजी भाषा की जो वैज्ञानिक शब्दावली है वह इंग्लिस्तान, अमरीका और इंग्लिस्तान की जो चार कालोनी हैं, कनाडा, आस्ट्रेलिया, साउथ अफ्रीका और न्यूजीलैंड, इन को छोड़ कर और कहीं नहीं चलती। फ्रांस में कुछ शब्द चलते हैं। आप अपने पड़ोसी देशों में जाइये, आप चीन में जाइये, आप जापान में जाइये। वहां पर अंग्रेजी शब्दावली बिल्कुल काम में नहीं लाई जाती। अगर अंग्रेजी वैज्ञानिक शब्दावली वैसी की वैसी यहां पर प्रयोग में लाई जायगी तो मैं आप से पूछना चाहता हूं कि हमारे यहां पर जब कुछ अच्छे वैज्ञानिक पैदा होंगे, कुछ खोजें होंगी, तो क्या वह भी लैटिन शब्दावली में लिखी जायेंगी? कौन सी शब्दावली में वह लिखी जायेंगी? यह बहुत ग़लत बात होगी कि इस प्रकार वैज्ञानिक शब्दावली को जो आजकल अंग्रेजी में चलती है, इंटरनेशनल या अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय मान कर वैसे के वैसे यहां पर स्वीकृत कर लिया जाय। यह हरगिज़ नहीं हो सकता।

हां, अंग्रेजी के जो शब्द प्रचलित हो गये हैं, जैसे टेलीफोन है, उन को बदलने के पक्ष में मैं नहीं हूं। मैं आप को एक बात बतलाऊं, हमारे प्रान्त में टेलीफोन के लिये "दूरभाष" शब्द को रखा गया है। मैं ने एक जगह इस शब्द का बोर्ड देखा "दूर भाष"। तो मैं ने "भाष" की जगह "भाग" "दूरभाग" पढ़ लिया। उस से मैं ने यह तात्पर्य लगाया कि यहां ४४० बोल्ट आदि की कोई इलैक्ट्रिसिटी की जगह होगी और यहां पर जाना उचित नहीं है, इसलिये यह लिखा है। इसी तरह साइकिल का नाम 'द्विचक्र', इस प्रकार के शब्दों के पक्ष में मैं नहीं हूं। जो शब्द हमारे यहां पर आ गये हैं, जैसे रेल है, टिकट है, प्लेटफार्म है, बाइसिकल है, मोटर कार है, एंजिन है, इस प्रकार के शब्दों को हमें ले लेना चाहिये। लेकिन इस का यह भी मतलब नहीं कि इस प्रकार के प्रचलित शब्दों के अलावा हम हज़ारों शब्दों की जो वैज्ञानिक शब्दावली है, वह अंग्रेजी से ले लें। यह बिल्कुल ग़लत बात होगी। इन दोनों बातों का हमें ध्यान रखना चाहिये।

तो हिन्दी के मुख्य स्रोत के बारे में कोई झगड़ा नहीं होना चाहिये। वह स्रोत क्या हो यह हमारे संविधान में स्पष्ट लिखा है। पर नयी शब्दावली की बात तो दूर रही, हमारे संविधान में जो शब्दावली स्वीकृत हो चुकी है, कम से कम उस के विषय में तो स्थिति स्पष्ट होनी चाहिये। मौलाना साहब ने फरमाया, मेरे प्रश्न के उत्तर में, कि इस बात की भी आज़ादी दे दी गयी है कि उसे भी बदलना हो तो बदला जाय। अब जिस शब्दावली के ऊपर हमारे लाखों रुपये खर्च हो चुके और जो शब्द हम ने रखे वह सब शब्द प्रचलित भी आज हो गये, वह हटाए जायं, यह कैसी बात है? जैसे संसद् शब्द को लीजिये, लोकसभा शब्द को लीजिये, विधेयक शब्द को लीजिये, विधि शब्द को लीजिये, यह सब शब्द हमारे संविधान में स्वीकृत किये गये थे और उस के कुछ महीने के अन्दर ही सारे देश में यह प्रचलित हो चुके। अब उन के स्थान पर और और शब्द प्रचलित किये जायं, यह बिल्कुल गलत बात होगी। और फिर इस में एक अंदेशा और है—कभी कोई बात निर्णीत मानी ही न जा सकेगी। हिन्दी की जो उन्नति नहीं हो रही है उस के क्या कारण हैं? एक तो इस का कारण है एक झूठा नारा। यह झूठा नारा है कि हिन्दी सब के ऊपर लादने का प्रयत्न किया जा रहा है। हिन्दी लादी जाने का कोई प्रयत्न नहीं हो रहा है। कम से कम मैं हिन्दी किसी पर लादी जाय, इस का विरोधी हूं। पर अंग्रेजी या उर्दू भाषा हमारे ऊपर लादी जाय इस का भी मैं विरोधी हूं। अगर किसी को अंग्रेजी भाषा अपने प्रान्त में रखना है तो रखे, बहुत खुशी से अपनी प्रान्तीय भाषा का गला घोंट कर वह अंग्रेजी भाषा को रख सकते हैं। किन्तु १४ करोड़ जो हिन्दी भाषाभाषी हैं, उन का गला

[सेठ गोविन्द दास]

घोंट कर वहां पर अंग्रेजी को रखने का प्रयत्न करना भी नितान्त अनुचित है ।

अभी यहां हमारे प्रधान मन्त्री जी का भाषण हुआ, हिन्दी में हुआ, तो क्या यह उन्होंने हिन्दी भाषा को लादने का प्रयत्न किया ? यह बात नहीं है । हिन्दी को हम ने अपनी राज भाषा माना है, राष्ट्र भाषा माना है । उस को अगर १५ वर्ष के अन्दर उचित स्थान प्राप्त करना है तो १६ वें वर्ष के प्रातःकाल तो वह राजभाषा बन नहीं सकती । हमें अभी से उस के लिये प्रयत्न करना चाहिये और जो प्रयत्न नहीं हो रहा है उस के दो प्रधान कारण हैं । एक तो यह झूठा नारा है और एक कारण यह है कि उस को सरकार को जिस प्रकार से मदद देनी चाहिये उस प्रकार से नहीं दे रही है । हमारे दो प्रकार के निर्माण कार्य हैं । एक तो पार्थिव वस्तुओं का निर्माण है जिस से हमारी आर्थिक उन्नति होगी, आर्थिक अवस्था सुधरेगी, मैं उस के पक्ष में हूं । लेकिन उसी के साथ एक दूसरा निर्माण है—बौद्धिक निर्माण; जिस की नींव भाषा है । जहां हम आर्थिक चीज़ों पर करोड़ों रुपये खर्च करने को तैयार हैं, वहां पर हिन्दी के लिये लाखों रुपये भी देने को तैयार नहीं हैं, यह हिन्दी के साथ अन्याय है । हिन्दी को अंग्रेजी का स्थान लेना है तो इस तथ्य को मौलाना साहब को मान लेना होगा । नहीं तो उन की सब योजनायें कागज़ में रह जायेंगी और एक योजना भी कार्यरूप में परिणत नहीं होने वाली है । हिन्दी के निर्माण के लिए भी लाखों नहीं करोड़ों चाहिएं । कम से कम दस करोड़ ।

Shri Barrow (Nominated—Anglo-Indians): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, being a member of a linguistic minority, I am almost tempted to enter into this language controversy, but since such a lot of heat has been generated in the House over this question, I think I will confine myself to rather a cold analysis of the Report of the Secondary Education Commission.

Sir, we have already been told about this Education Commission, about the Committee which has been set up to go into the recommendations and the points that have been drawn up. Now, Sir, my difficulty is this. I would ask the Education Minister to let us know how these recommendations are going to be implemented. I will just give him, and it is rather an awkward one, one instance. The Secondary Education Commission on this language question has recommended that both English and Hindi should be introduced in the middle school stage. The Bombay Government has decided: "English shall not be taught in any of the standards of the middle school". I understand the constitutional difficulty, but if the recommendations of the Secondary Education Commission are to have any value, I would like to have a categorical statement from the hon. Minister of Education as to how they are going to be implemented.

Sir, I now turn to the report. There are very many commendable and salutary features in it—the recommendations on the method of recruitment, the recommendations on the system of inspection, an integrated pattern of administrative reorganisation, etc.

I was also impressed with the long dissertations on the aims of education, character training, personality development, citizenship training, dynamic methods of teaching, etc., but I have a vague suspicion that all these can be found in many text books on educational theory. When we come to the most vital and fundamental problems, where we expected boldness, clarity, definiteness, vision and imagination, we find the report is full of either hesitancy, vagueness, evasiveness or unreality. I refer, Sir, to Finance, Status of Teachers, Question of languages—which I will not deal with further because of the already heated atmosphere in the House—and Religious Education.

Coming to the question of finance,—the Commissioners have painted a striking picture of "The Secondary School as we visualise". I have no doubt of the quality of the pigments they have used, the quality of the brushes they have used, and that their innate artistry is superb, but I think the canvas they have used is rather thin—I refer to finance. Nowhere have they worked out what such a school is going to cost. They have recommended that the number of pupils in a class should be between 30 and 40 and the maximum number of pupils in the school, 750. I would ask how they expect with the limited finance of the States, such schools to be brought into existence. They could have worked out and said: "This is the cost of one school, the number of school going children is so many, we will require so many schools and the total expenditure involved will be so much". Then again, if they had also taken into consideration the fact that there is a directive in the Constitution that compulsory education should be up to the age of 14, I am certain they would have realised that the whole structure of the finances of the school they visualised, would have come to the ground.

The Kher Committee recommended that at least twenty per cent. of the State finances should be spent on Education. I know two States—I am not referring to Part C States—Bombay and Madras, that are spending twenty per cent. I do not want to say anything about the loss of revenue from prohibition but they are spending twenty per cent. on Education. What do we find? They have to appeal to the Central Government for help for primary education. We find also that Madras has to toy with such schemes as the "Rajaji Scheme", which is highly controversial, because there is not sufficient finance.

Had the Secondary Education Commission considered the question of finance realistically, they would have come to two inevitable conclusions. One is that private and voluntary institutions will and must continue for years to provide secondary education. The second is that the Central Government must provide more finance and what follows is that more finance from Central Government revenues must be made available for Education.

The Kher Committee recommended that one-tenth of the revenues of the Central Government should be made available for Education. I believe I am not wrong in saying that we are at present spending only one-twenty-fifth of the revenues available and if we spend only this amount, I stress that we will not be able to finance any of the schemes as put forward by the Secondary Education Commission. Sir, if the Central Government is going to spend more money on Education, I would suggest that they spend it on secondary education.

I think that the time has come when there must be sweeping reforms. I believe that the Constitution is going to be amended. I believe that the whole country realises that if secondry education is to be properly organised then it must come within the purview of the Centre. Sir, I would plead with the Minister to get the support of the Congress Party and have the Constitution amended so that Secondary Education comes within the purview of the Centre.

I am giving a quotation from a leading educational journal as a commentary on the States being the final arbiters of Education: "They have no money but they have full powers; they have no material resources but they have ready-made schemes; they may lack in personnel but they have uncompromising dogmas".

I turn to the question of the status of teachers. It is true that the Secondary Education Commission has gone beyond lip-service. When I say so, I do mean we have reached the ideal which the Lady in the Play "Gentlemen Prefer Blondes" would like, when she says: "A kiss on the hand is all very fine; but a diamond bracelet will last a life time". We have not reached a stage where we can give our teachers diamond bracelets, but the

[Shri Barrow]

Secondary Education Commission has made certain, shall I say, commendable recommendations.

One is a triple-benefit scheme; the second is for medical relief, and the third is for housing schemes. I would urge the Central Government to implement the first two schemes, namely, the scheme for triple benefits—pension, insurance and provident fund—and for medical relief. I am in serious doubt whether the third scheme—the housing scheme—will ever find favour with the public at large, when they themselves have no houses!

I say, Sir, that the Commission's Report is evasive on the fundamental question of salaries of teachers. It urges the State Governments to form committees to go into the question of salaries of the teachers. I believe that the Secondary Education Commission—a body of experts—could have at least laid down the minimum salaries: it could have laid down the minimum salaries which the States must implement.

They have also dealt, in an implied way, with the basic principles on which the salaries should be fixed. They have asked that the cost of living be taken into consideration. I say that there are more important factors than the mere cost of living. One such basic factor is the test of personal need. What is the kind of life that we expect our teachers to live? If they are going to transmit our social heritage then they must be able to play a full part in the social life of the community.

Then there is the market test: this is the crucial test. What are the earnings of other professions in the other fields of life? If our teachers are to live with any dignity then they must be paid wages comparable to those earned by other people in other professions. These are the two tests which I would ask the Minister to apply, and to have this whole question examined.

Finally, before I finish I would like to digress for a moment and ask the Central Ministry to frame a policy so that the grants that are given by the Centre to the States should be towards the salaries of teachers, so that they might live with some comfort and dignity.

Two more points.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No more points. What is this? I am ringing the bell and he starts a new thing.

Hon. Members want to speak and therefore I am requesting the hon. Minister to speak only tomorrow....

An Hon. Member: Tomorrow is Sunday.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: 'Tomorrow' always means the next working day. Whatever time is taken—twenty-five or thirty minutes—will be adjusted and we will sit for the other demands till sometime later at the end of the day. Some hon. Members are here and I have given opportunity to some; I must give an opportunity to Shri M. H. Rahman. I have not called anybody from the South and I intend calling Mr. Chettiar. With this we will close at 6 P.M. The next day I will call the hon. Minister to speak.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: What about the other business?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Others will have to stay; I cannot provide for every one.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: I am asking about the other resolution.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The other resolution—comes up at six o'clock.

شری ایم - ایچ - رحمان : جناب ڈپٹی اسپیکر صاحب - اس وقت وزارت تعلیم کے سلسلے میں ڈیمانڈس پر تقریریں ہو رہی ہیں - میں نے بہت اطمینان کے ساتھ ان تقریروں کو

ملا - ٹنڈن جی اور سیٹھ گووند داس کی تقریروں سے مجھے بہت زیادہ حیرت ہوئی اور میں نے یہ بات محسوس کی کہ ایک ایسے معاملے میں جو پارلیامنٹری معاملہ ہو اور جس پر بہت ہی سلجھیدگی کے ساتھ سوچنے اور غور کرنے کا موقع دیا جائے اس پر اچھی طرح اپنے وچار رکھے جائیں اور دوسرے وچاروں کے لئے بھی کھلا ہوا موقع ملنا چاہئے - اس میں ایک بہت ہی خوبصورت الفاظ کے ساتھ جب اردو کا ذکر آتا ہے تو پاکستان ، مسٹر جناح اور مسلم لیگ یہ تینوں ایسے بھوت سامنے لا دیئے جاتے ہیں کہ جس کے بعد کسی دوسرے آدمی کو کسی دوسرے خیال کو ظاہر کرنے کی گنجائش ہی نہ ہو ، جرات ہی نہ ہو - اس طرح کا رعب ڈالنے اور خوف پیدا کرنے کے لئے کم از کم زبان کے مسئلے میں میرے نزدیک یہ طریقہ حد درجہ شرمناک اور پارلیامنٹری اصول کے بالکل خلاف ہے - جہاں تک زبان کا تعلق ہے اردو زبان کے بارے میں یہ کہہ دینا تاریخ کو جھٹلانا ہے کہ اس کی حیثیت انگریزی زبان کی ہو جاتی ہے اور وہ بھی باہر سے آئی ہوئی زبان ہے اور اگر انگریزی آہستہ آہستہ ختم ہو جائے تو اردو کو بھی اس طرح آہستہ آہستہ ختم ہو جانا چاہئے -

श्री वी० जी० देशपांडे: खतम हो गई है।

شری ایم - ایچ - رحمان : یہ بات قطعاً باطل اور جھوٹ ہے اور اس مسئلہ کو آج جس طریقے سے پیش کیا گیا ہے میرے نزدیک وہ بالکل غلط ہے - اردو زبان کسی معنی میں صرف مسلمانوں کی ہی زبان نہیں مانی جا سکتی - یہ بات طے شدہ ہے جس میں دو رائے نہیں ہیں کہ ہندی زبان ہماری وطنی زبان ہے ملکی زبان ہے اور ہماری راشٹر بھاشا ہے -

اس کو پھلنا پھولنا چاہئے اور اس کے لئے جتنے بہتر سے بہتر طریقے سے انتظام ہو سکے - وہ ہونا چاہئے - تاکہ جلد سے جلد انگریزی کی جگہہ وہ لے سکے - اس میں کوئی دو رائیں نہیں - لیکن اس مسئلہ کے ساتھ ساتھ بار بار اردو کے خلاف زہر اگلنا کیا معنی رکھتا ہے ؟ اردو کے بارے میں میں یہ عرض کرنا چاہتا ہوں کہ ہاؤس خود بھی غور کرے - ہم اگر ہندی کو راشٹر بھاشا مانتے ہیں ، تسلیم کرتے ہیں - تو کیا اس کے یہ معنی ہیں کہ دوسری زبانوں کو کوئی سہولت ، کوئی ترقی ، سرکاری طور پر نہیں ملنی چاہئے - یا ان کو کسی قسم کی امداد ملنی نہیں چاہئے - یہ بات کسی طریقہ سے بھی ہمیں منظور نہیں - یہ کہنا کہ ہم اردو کے مخالف نہیں ہیں - یہ کہ شبلی اکیڈمی کی امداد کے لئے جو گرانٹ ہے - اس کے ہم مخالف نہیں - انجمن ترقی اردو کو جو

کا سب سے بڑا ورودھی رہا ہوں - میں اس وقت بول رہا ہوں جب کہ وقت بہت تھوڑا ہے - ورنہ پرشوتم داس جی ٹنڈن اس بات کے گواہ ہیں کہ جس وقت ہمارے لیڈروں نے آل انڈیا کانگریس کمیٹی میں یہ سوال پیش کیا کہ ہم پاکستان کو قبول کرتے ہیں- اس وقت پنڈت جواہر لال نہرو - مولانا ابوالکلام آزاد - پنڈت گووند بلبھ پنت اور سردار ولبھ بھائی پٹیل کی تقریروں کے بعد سب سے پہلا شخص اے- آئی- سی- سی- میں یہ حفظالرحمان تھا جس نے کہا کہ پاکستان بزدل ہے - اس کو نہ مانئے- اور ہم اس کے لئے آخر تک لڑیں گے - اور ہم گاندھی جی کی رہنمائی میں سارے ملک کو آزاد کرا سکتے ہیں - آپ آج اس طرح سے اصلیت کو چھپانے کی کوشش نہ کیجئے - آپ کو کسی دوسرے نقطہ نظر کے خیال سے مسلم لیگی اور پاکستانی تحریک بتا کر اس طرح سے صحیح چیز کو دبانے کی کوشش نہیں کرنی چاہئے - اسلامی تمدن - سکھ تمدن - ہندو تمدن کوئی مر نہیں سکتا - یہاں پر ہندو بس رہے ہیں - مسلمان بس رہے ہیں - یا دوسری کمونٹیز بس رہی ہیں - ان کے تمدن زندہ رہیں گے - کوئی طاقت ان تمدنوں کو نہیں مٹا سکتی - ان تمام تمدنوں کو ملا کر بھارتیہ سنسکرتی اور تمدن بنا ہے - اس لئے

[شری ایم- ایچ- رحمان]

امداد دی جا رہی ہے ہم اس کے مخالف نہیں ہیں - لیکن جو اعلان اور لفظ آتے ہیں وہ بیکار ہو جاتے ہیں- طریقہ کار بیان کرنے کا الگ الگ ہوتا ہے - کسی چیز کی مخالفت کے دو ڈھنگ ہوتے ہیں - ایک کھلا ہوا ڈھنگ ہوتا ہے - اور دوسرا چور دروازہ سے - صاف الفاظ میں وہ نہیں کہنا چاہتے- راشٹر بھاشا کی خوبی بھی اسی میں ہے کہ اس کی ترقی کے ساتھ ساتھ جو دوسری زبانیں ہیں جیسا کہ تیلگو زبان - ملیالم زبان - تامل زبان - بنگلا زبان - ان کی بھی ترقی ہونا ضروری ہے میں تو پوچھتا ہوں آخر اردو زبان کا ذکر کرنا کیا گناہ ہے - آخر اردو کو بھی وہی جگہہ کیوں نہ دی جائے جو اس کا حق ہے - اگر فرض کیجئے کہ مدھیہ بھارت میں - مدھیہ پردیش یا بہار میں یہ بات صاف ہو جائے کہ وہاں بہت بڑی تعداد میں ہندو مسلمان اور سکھ جو بستے ہیں وہ اردو زبان بولتے ہیں تو اردو میں بھی کیوں نہ ان کی تعلیم ہو اور وہاں عدالتی سہولتیں اردو کو کیوں نہ ملیں- اس زبان کے زیر سایہ جس کو ہم راشٹر بھاشا کہتے ہیں - مل جانے کی بات میں کہوں تو میں کون سے پاکستان کی یا کون سی مسلم لیگ کی بات کہتا ہوں - اس طرح کی باتوں سے کام نہیں چل سکتا - میں خود اپنے آپ دیش میں مسلم لیگ

بنا هندو تمدن اور اسلامی تمدن کی حفاظت کے بھارتیہ سانسکرتی وجوہ میں نہیں آ سکتی - اور اونچا درجہ پیدا نہیں هو سکتا - اس لئے یہاں سبھی تمدن باقی رهیں گے - ان کو کوئی مٹا نہیں سکتا - کیونکہ ان کی وجہ سے پاکستان نہیں بنا - پاکستان بنانے والوں نے سیاسی وجوهات سے بنایا هے - یہ مختلف وجوهات سے بنا هے - اس میں زبان کا اور اردو زبان کا کوئی دخل نہیں هے - اس زبان کے اندر بڑے بڑے لیکھک اور مصنف اور بڑے بڑے کوی اور شاعر هندو - مسلمان اور سکھ رهے هیں - اس کو نظر انداز کیسے کیا جا سکتا هے جو اس تحریک کو فرقہ پرست بتاتے هیں وہ لوگ تو فرقہ پرستی کے نام سے شاید آشنا نہیں - یا خود فرقہ پرستی یا اور تنگ دلی میں مبتلا هیں - میں نہیں پسند کرتا کہ اس طرح سے اس بہترین هاؤس میں جہاں پارلیامینٹری اصولوں پر گفتگو کی جاتی هے - وهاں اس قسم کی فرقہ پرستانہ ذهنیت کا مظاهرہ کیا جائے ، پاکستان کا حوالہ دے کر محض جذبات کو ابھارا جائے - هم تو خود خاموشی سے - سنجیدگی سے اس معاملہ پر غور کرنا چاهتے هیں - اس میں کیا برائی هے - کیا اُردو نے پاکستان بنایا هے - اُردو نے پاکستان نہیں بنایا هے - هندی نے پاکستان نہیں بنایا - کیا زبانیں تیوایڈ کیا کرتی هیں - زبانیں کبھی ڈویژن نہیں کیا کرتیں - دلوں کی کھوٹ اور دلوں کی بےایمانی ڈیوایڈ کرتی هے - اور بےایمانی آئندہ بھی نقصان پہنچا سکتی هے - پاکستان تو اس نے نہیں بنایا - یہ کہنے کی باتیں هیں - هم ٹنڈن جی اور ان کے ساتھیوں کی فرقہ پرستانہ ذهنیت سے کیا مرعوب هو سکتے هیں جبکہ همیں یقین هے کہ همارے اندر کسی بھی هندوستانی سے کم اپنے ملک کی آزادی کے لئے جذبہ نہیں هے - میں آپ حضرات کی کیا بات کہوں - پنڈت جواهر لال نہرو اور بڑے بڑے جو همارے لیڈر بیٹھے هوئے هیں ان سے بھی زیادہ همارے اندر جذبہ هے - کم نہیں هے - هم نے ملک کے لئے اپنا خون پسینہ بہایا - اور ملک کو آزاد کرایا هے - هم نے پاکستان کو اور پارٹیشن کو نہ صرف هندوستانی کی حیثیت سے بلکہ کمونل نقطہ نظر سے - مسلمانوں کے نقطہ نظر سے بدترین سمجھا - هم نے یہ سمجھا هے - کہ پاکستان اس لئے نہیں بن رها هے کہ مسلمانوں کو اس ذریعہ سے انگریز کوئی بڑا فائدہ پہنچانا چاهتے هیں بلکہ اس لئے کہ ڈویژن کرایا هے کہ وہ اور امریکہ همیشہ ایک دوسرے ٹکڑے کے ذریعہ دوسرے ٹکڑے کو خوفزدہ اور بےاطمینان رکھے اور کبھی دونوں ٹکڑوں میں سچا پریم پیدا نہ هونے دے پس اگر هم نے اردو کا سوال پیش کیا هے - یا اگر بہار - مدھیہ پردیش سے یہ آواز اٹھے گی تو کیا قیامت برپا هو جائے گی - اور اُردو کو ایک سرکاری

[شری ایم- ایچ- رحمان]

حیثیت - خواہ وہ عدالتی حیثیت ہو یا تعلیمی حیثیت ہو - دی جاتی ہے - تو کیا مصیبت پیدا ہو جائے گی - اپنے ملک کے آزاد ہونے کی حیثیت سے - اپنے ملک کی ایک مشترکہ زبان ہونے کی حیثیت سے - اپنے ہندو مسلمان بھائیوں کے ایک پریم کے ساگر سمندر میں کھو جانے کی حیثیت سے اگر اس کو یہ حیثیت دی جاتی ہے تو کیا ہوا - اس کو فرقہ پرستی کہنا خود فرقہ پرستی ہے -

اس بنا پر میں گذارش کرونگا کہ اس معاملہ میں اور جتنی باتیں کی جائیں مجھے اس سے بحث نہیں ہے- جہاں تک ہندی کو بڑھانے کا مسئلہ ہے ہم لوگ ہم خیال ہیں کہ آپ اسپر زیادہ سے زیادہ روپیہ خرچ کریں اس کا پرچار کریں - میں اگرچہ ان لوگوں میں سے ہوں جنہوں نے کانسٹیٹیونٹ اسمبلی میں ہندوستانی کا ساتھ دیا تھا - لیکن جس دن ہماری کانسٹی ٹیونٹ اسمبلی نے ہندی کو سرکاری زبان طے کر دیا - اس دن ایمانداری سے ہم نے اس کو مان لیا - اور اسی ملت سے ہم ہندی کو راشٹر بھاشا سمجھتے ہیں لہذا وزارت تعلیم پر یہ الزام لگانا کہ وہ ہندی کے خلاف رخ رکھتی ہے قطعاً غلط ہے لیکن ا کے ساتھ ساتھ میں ایک ملت کیلئے بھی ماننے کے لئے تیار نہیں کہ سیٹھ جی کے کہنے کے مطابق اُردو کو انگریزی کے درجہ میں سمجھ لیا جائے اُردو کی وہ حیثیت ہرگز نہیں ہے بلکہ وہ اِسی ملک کی سنسکرتی کا ایک اہم جز ہے جسکو کسی طرح نظر انداز نہیں کیا جا سکتا- اُردو کو اس ملک میں ایک اہم جگہہ حاصل ہے - اسلئے اگر یہ چیز کوئی ہم سے چھڑانا چاہے تو چھڑا نہیں سکتا - کوئی تواریخ اور اتہاس کا جاننے والا نہیں چھین سکتا - وہ چیز اپنی جگہہ رہنی چاہئے - اس کی یونین یعنی مرکزی حکومت اور پرانتیہ تذاورتوں کے اندر مناسب جگہہ ہونی چاہئے - قدم قدم پر اس کی حوصلہ افزائی ہونی چاہئے - ہم کو تو وزارئے تعلیم سے یہ شکایت ہے کہ تعلیم کے بارے میں جو مرکزی وزیر تعلیم کے ماتحت صوبوں کے وزرائے تعلیم کی کانفرینس ہوئی تھی - اس میں اُردو کے بارے میں جو پالیسی طے پائی تھی اس پر خاص طور سے اُتر پردیش میں اور بعض دوسری جگہوں میں عمل نہیں ہو رہا ہے - میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ ضرورت ہے کہ وزیر تعلیم کم سے کم اس مسئلہ کو جان لیں اور مرکزی وزارئے تعلیم اس پالیسی کو پوری مضبوطی سے عمل میں لائے اور ریاستوں کی تعلیمی وزراتوں سے اُس پر عمل کرائے -

اس کے ساتھ ساتھ میں ایک چیز اور بھی عرض کرونگا - غالباً اور بھائی بھی اس مسئلے کو پیش کرینگے -

یہاں پر عرصے سے ایک کیمپ کالج چل رہا ہے - جسے ہمارے پرشارتھی بھائی چلا رہے ہیں - قریب ساڑھے چار ہزار لڑکے اس میں تعلیم پاتے ہیں اور یہاں کے ایمپلائیز کی ایک بہت بڑی تعداد اس میں تعلیم حاصل کرتی ہے - پچھلے دنوں مرکزی گورنمنٹ نے اس کو ایک دو مرتبہ اس بات کی اجازت دیدی کہ اس کی توسیع کر دی جائے اور اس کو باقی رکھا جائے - لیکن اس سال یہ معلوم ہوا ہے کہ مرکزی حکومت اس کو ختم کرنا چاہتی ہے - مجھے یہ بات معلوم ہوئی - (اگر یہ غلط ہو تو بہت اچھا ہے -) معلوم ہوا ہے کہ اس کی وجہ یہ ہے کہ دہلی یونیورسٹی کے قاعدے کے مطابق یہ ایک ایسے ایریا میں آگئی ہے کہ جب تک دہلی یونیورسٹی اس کو قبول نہ کرے اس وقت تک مرکزی حکومت اس پر دباؤ نہیں ڈال سکتی کہ اس کو قائم رکھا جائے - معلوم ہوا ہے کہ دہلی یونیورسٹی اس کا بوجھ نہیں اٹھانا چاہتی - اس کی کچھ دقتیں ہو سکتی ہیں جنکی وجہ سے وہ اس کی ذمہ‌داری نہیں لینا چاہتی - تو قانونی طور پر اس کو توسیع نہیں مل سکتی - اور اس کو اگلے سال کنسیشن نہیں ملیگا - میری گذارش ہے کہ یہ ایک بہترین کالج ہے - اور اس کے نتائج بہترین سے بہترین اس وقت موجود ہیں اور یہاں پر بہترین تعلیم دی جا رہی ہے - ایسے ادارے کو مرکزی وزارت جس طرح سے ہو قائم رکھنے کی کوشش کرے - ایسے ادارے کو توڑ دینا تو آسان ہے لیکن اس کو بنانا اور بہتر سے بہتر چلانا مشکل ہے - میں یونیورسٹی کی قانونی دقتوں سے واقف نہیں ہوں - اگر دہلی یونیورسٹی اس کو لیلے -

पंडित ठाकुर दास भार्गव : यह मसला तय हो चुका है। यह कालिज पंजाब यूनीवरसिटी के मातहत रह सकता है। यह चीज दिल्ली यूनीवरसिटी के कायदे के मुताबिक होगी।

شری ایم - ایم - رحمان : میں امید کرونگا کہ وزارت تعلیم اس پر خاص توجہ کریگی اور اس بات کو نوٹ کریگی کہ اس کالج کو باقی اور زندہ رکھے -

[*English translation of the above speech.*]

[**Shri M. M. Rahman** (Distt. Muradabad—Central): Sir, I have been attentively listening to the speeches made on the demands of the Education Ministry. I was greatly astonished to hear the speeches of Shri Tandon and Seth Govind Das and I felt that when an opportunity is given for serious consideration of matters of Parliamentary importance, observation should be made in a proper manner. Due opportunity should also be given to others to express their views. Here, while referring to Urdu, phantoms of Pakistan, Mr. Jinnah and Muslim League have been let loose in a beautiful language in such a way that no scope is left for others, to express and even dare express their ideas. Harassing and cowing down others in this manner at least in the matter of language is very shameful and goes against Parliamentary principles. So far as Urdu language is concerned, it amounts to a denial of the facts of History to say that the

[Shri M. H. Rahman]

status of this language is the same as that of English and that it has been imported from outside, and that like English, Urdu should also die out by and by.

Shri V. G. Deshpande: It is dead.

Shri M. H. Rahman: It is absolutely wrong. Moreover, in my view, the way this matter has been presented today is entirely wrong. Urdu can in no way be considered a language of the Muslims only. It is an admitted fact—and there are no two opinions on it—that Hindi is the language of our country, and it is our national language. It should prosper and we should work to this end in the best way we can, so that it can take the place of English as early as possible. There is no controversy over it. But I am at a loss to understand why while dealing with this issue, every now and then, Urdu should be made a target of attacks. If we accept Hindi as our national language, does it mean that no other language should receive encouragement or aid from the Government for its development? We are in no way prepared to accept this position? To say time and again that 'we are not against Urdu, we do not oppose the grant given to the Shibli Academy', or 'we do not oppose the aid given to Anjuman-e-Taraqqi Urdu', has no meaning. There are different ways of saying the same thing. There are two ways of opposing a thing—to express opposition openly or indirectly by not expressing it in clear words. The virtue of the national language lies in this that along with it other languages such as Telugu, Malyalam, Tamil and Bengali should also prosper. I would ask in what way it is a sin to make mention of Urdu. Why should not Urdu be given the place it deserves? If, for example, it is proved that a large number of Hindu, Muslim and Sikh residents of C.P. or Bihar speak Urdu, why, then, should Urdu not be their medium of education and why should Urdu not be used in the courts? If while accepting our national language as it is, I demand these facilities, wherein do I talk in the vein of Muslim League or Pakistan? Such talk will not help us long. I myself have been a great opponent of the Muslim League in this country. I cannot elaborate this point in view of the short time at my disposal. Even Purushottam Dassji Tandon will bear me out when I say that when the question of accepting Pakistan came before the All India Congress Committee, after the speeches of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, Pandit Govind Vallabh Pant and Sardar Vallabh Bhai Patel, I was the first man to make this assertion that it is cowardice to accept Pakistan and that it should never be accepted, that we will fight against it to the end, and that we can liberate the whole of the country under the guidance of Gandhiji. Today you should not try to conceal the truth in this way. You should not, with some other motive, suppress the truth by labelling it as a Muslim League and Pakistani movement. No culture—Muslim, Sikh or Hindu—can ever die. Hindus, Muslims and many other communities are inhabiting this land. The culture of each of these communities will continue to exist. No power can efface these cultures. All these cultures together make what we call the Indian culture and civilisation. Therefore, no Indian culture can exist or develop without the protection of Hindu and Muslim cultures. All these cultures will continue to co-exist in this country and no one can extirpate them because they have not been the cause of the creation of Pakistan. The builders of Pakistan have built it on political grounds, on grounds different from that of culture. The question of any language, or Urdu language, is not involved in it. We have great writers, authors and poets in this language and they have been Hindus, Muslims as well as Sikhs. How can this fact be ignored? Those who name this movement as communal, they either do not know what communalism is or are themselves living in a groove of communalism

and narrow-mindedness. I do not like that such communal tendency should be displayed and sentiments roused by making reference to Pakistan in this august House where our talk has to be in accordance with Parliamentary principles. We are prepared to think over this matter in a silent and serious manner. What is the harm in it? How did Urdu create Pakistan? No, it has not. Nor has Hindi. Do languages create divisions? Malicious intentions and insincerity divides people and insincerity can do further harm. Pakistan is not a creation of Urdu. That is a baseless allegation. But we cannot be cowed down by this communal tendency of Tandonji and his colleagues, because we are sure that we have no less love for the freedom of our country than any other Indian. What can I say of these people, we have got even greater patriotism than Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and other great leaders. We have shed our blood and sweat for the sake of the country and have attained freedom. We did not look down upon the idea of the Pakistan and partition only from the point of Indians but also from the communal point of view of Muslims. We did not feel that Pakistan was created because the British wished the Muslims to benefit by it. On the other hand, we felt that by creating this division they and the Americans would always harass one part with the help of the other and thus disturb their peace and never allow the two parts to come close to each other.

If, therefore, we raise the question of Urdu, if the people of Bihar or Madhya Pradesh raise this demand, the heavens won't fall. If Urdu is given some official status, whether as a court language or as a medium of education, no harm would be done. If in our free country, where we have a common language and where Hindus and Muslims live together in love and fellowship, Urdu is also given this status, nothing untoward would happen. To term it as communalism is by itself communalistic.

I would submit that I have nothing to say against other issues that may be raised in this connection. So far as Hindi is concerned, we are all unanimous that we should spend the largest possible funds for its development and propagation. Though I was one of those who in the Constituent Assembly supported Hindustani, yet right from the day, right from the minute the Constituent Assembly decided upon Hindi as the official language, we sincerely accepted it as our national language. It is, therefore, absolutely wrong to accuse the Education Ministry of adopting an anti-Hindi attitude. But at the same time, we are never prepared to agree that, as Sethji has said, Urdu should be relegated to the position of English. That is never the position of Urdu. On the other hand, it is an important component of the culture of this country and can never be overlooked. Urdu has a place of importance in this country and even if anybody tries to detach it from us he can never do so. No man with any knowledge of history can do so. Urdu will continue to hold its place. It should be given a proper place in the Centre and the States. It should be given all encouragement.

We have a complaint against the Education Ministry that the policy in regard to Urdu that was decided upon at a conference of the Central and State Education Ministers, is not being properly implemented in Uttar Pradesh and other States. I feel that there is great need for the Education Minister to understand this problem and for the Ministry to take a strong attitude and have this policy enforced in the States.

I would like to submit one more point. Perhaps other friends may also raise it. The Camp College has been functioning here for several years and our displaced friends are running it. Nearly 4,500 students are receiving eduction in this College and large number of employees receive education in this College. In the past, the Central Government have granted it extension twice, but this year it is learnt that the Government want to close it. I

[Shri M. H. Rahman]

learn—I wish it were not true—that under the Delhi University rules, this college is functioning in a territory where it cannot continue to function unless the Delhi University recognises it and that the Central Government cannot exert any pressure in this matter. Due to some difficulties the Delhi University does not want to bear the burden of this college and from the legal point of view it cannot be given any extension and it cannot get the concession for another year. I submit that it is a very good institution, it provides very good education and it has shown good results. The Central Government should try its best to let the College continue. It is easy to close down such an institution but it is difficult to build one and run it efficiently.

पंडित ठाकुर दास भार्गव : यह मसला तय हो चुका है। वह कालिज पंजाब यूनीवर्सिटी के मातहत रह सकता है। यह चीज दिल्ली यूनीवर्सिटी के कायदे के मुताबिक होगी।

Shri M. H. Rahman: I hope the Education Ministry will pay special attention to this matter and keep the College functioning.]

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: A number of so-called "back-benchers"—all eminent Members of Parliament—about fifty of them, have sent me a letter yesterday saying that they get no chance at all to speak and hon. Members in the front benches are only being called. I requested them to send me a list of those hon. Members who want to speak distributing the names over different Ministries. They have given me one name, Mr. Ram Dass to speak on Education and if I do not call him it will not be proper. I therefore propose to call him now and I would request the hon. Members to sit till 7-15 today. I will close this debate on Education at 6-15; the hon. Minister will reply on the next day and at 6-15 I will take up the other Resolution.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Does it mean that the Minimum Wages (Amendment) Bill will not be taken up today?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It will be taken up. After all, the Resolution will not take much time and as soon as it is over, the Minimum Wages (Amendment) Bill will be taken up.

श्री राम दास (होशियारपुर—रक्षित—अनुसूचित जातियां) : यह शिक्षा का मसला देश का जरूरी मसला है लेकिन शिक्षा के साथ वह सलूक नहीं किया गया जो कि उसके साथ होना चाहिए था। रुपया देने में भी इसके साथ कंजूसी की गयी है और समय देने में भी कंजूसी की गयी है। दूसरे जो बजट के आइटम हैं उनके लिए पालियामेंट दो दो तीन तीन और चार चार दिन दे सकी लेकिन तालीम का मसला जो सबसे अहम है उसके लिए दो तीन घंटे देना भी मुश्किल हो रहा है। मैं समझता हूं कि यह तालीम के साथ स्टेप मदरली सलूक है। मैं नहीं जान सकता कि एडवाइजरी कमेटी ने और मिनिस्टर साहब ने यह कैसे मंजूर कर लिया कि दो तीन घंटे में इस बड़े मसले पर बहस हो सकेगी।

सन् १९४७ के पहले भी हम सुनते थे कि हमारा तालीमी ढांचा खराब है और हमारे मुल्क के लिए नुकसानदेह है। लेकिन उस वक्त हम समझते थे कि इसके लिए जो विदेशी हुक्मरां हैं वह जिम्मेवार हैं। १९४७ के बाद इन आजादी के सालों के अन्दर भी शायद ही कोई कनवोकेशन एड्रेस या प्राइज डिस्ट्रीब्यूशन के मौक़े पर कोई स्पीच हुई होगी जिसके अन्दर यह नहीं कहा गया कि यह सिस्टम आफ एजूकेशन हमारे मुल्क के लिए बहुत ही गैर मुफीद है और नुकसानदेह है। यहां तक कि एजूकेशन मिनिस्टर खुद प्रीसाइड करके अपनी स्पीचों के अन्दर यही कहते रहे हैं कि यह जो हमारी तालीम का ढांचा है यह निहायत खराब है और उसको बदलना चाहिए। लेकिन सात साल से यह एजूकेशन मिनिस्टर बरसरे इक्तिदार हैं लेकिन मैं समझता हूं कि इस तालीम के अन्दर कोई

किसी किस्म की तबदीली नहीं हुई । बाकी मिनिस्ट्रीज ने अपने आपको बदला है और हालात के मुताबिक अपने आपको एडेप्ट किया है लेकिन यह एक एजूकेशन मिनिस्ट्री ही है जो कि बदलने के लिए बिल्कुल तैयार नहीं है । उस दिन हाउस के अन्दर एक मेम्बर ने सुझाव दिया था कि यहां एक कमीशन बनना चाहिए जो कि उस काम को करे । मैं भी आप के सामने यह अर्ज करूंगा कि मालूम होता है कि एजूकेशन मिनिस्ट्री के पास आगे ही बहुत ज्यादा काम है जिसको वह संभाल नहीं सकती इसलिए पालियामेंट को कोई कमीशन ऐसा मुकर्रर करना चाहिए जो कि एजूकेशन के ढांचे में रीफार्म करने के लिए जल्द से जल्द काम कर सके ।

मैंने एजूकेशन की रिपोर्ट पढ़ी । मुझे ऐसा मालूम होता है कि वह कमीशनों के नाम, कमेटियों के नाम और सब कमेटियों के नाम की फेहरिस्त है । सारी रिपोर्ट नामों से भरी है । लेकिन यह कहीं नहीं लिखा है कि उन्होंने काम क्या किया है । इसलिए मैं आपसे यह दरख्वास्त करूंगा कि एजूकेशन को बदलना निहायत जरूरी है और जब तक हम इसको नहीं बदलेंगे हम राइट टाइप आफ सिटीजन पैदा नहीं कर सकेंगे । अगर जरूरत हो तो पालियामेंट को इसके लिए एक नयी मिनिस्ट्री बनानी चाहिए या कोई नया कमीशन मुकर्रर करना चाहिए ताकि वह जल्द से जल्द इस ढांचे को बदल सकें और हमारे मंशा के मुताबिक हमारे बच्चे तालीम हासिल कर सकें ।

कांस्टीट्यूशन के मुताबिक यह यूनियन गवर्नमेंट का फर्ज है कि वह दस साल के अन्दर इस मुल्क के अन्दर कम्पलसरी तालीम लायेगी और तमाम मुल्क के अन्दर स्कूल एजूकेशन हो जायगी । जिस तरह से आप मिलीटरी व कम्युनिकेशन्स या दूसरी जरूरी चीजों को यूनियन लेबिल पर ट्रीट करते हैं उसी तरह से १४ साल तक के बच्चों की तालीम को भी यूनियन लेबिल पर ट्रीट किया जाय और यह यूनियन गवर्नमेंट की जिम्मेदारी हो । तभी इल्लिटिरेसी दूर हो सकती है । शिक्षा एक चीज है और शब्द बोध दूसरी चीज है । इस वक्त मुल्क के अन्दर इल्लिटिरेसी इतनी ज्यादा है कि सरकार इसका अन्दाजा नहीं लगा सकती । मैं एक उदाहरण देना चाहता हूं कि किस तरह से लोगों में जहालत है । मैं अभी गांवों के अन्दर फिर रहा था तो जिस इलाके में भाखरा और नांगल की नहरों से पानी मिलने वाला है उन गांवों के अन्दर यह ख्याल पैदा हो रहा है कि यह पानी न हमारे इस्तैमाल के काबिल है, न हमारे जानवरों के पीने के काबिल है और न यह हमारी जमीन के लिए ही अच्छा होगा । वह कहते हैं कि यह पानी हमारी जमीनों को खराब कर देगा, हमें बीमार कर देगा और हमारे जानवरों को खराब कर देगा । मैंने पूछा क्यों । तो उन्होंने कहा कि इस पानी में से सरकार सारी की सारी बिजली तो निकाल ही लेती है । वह भाखरा में, नांगल में और चार पांच जगहों पर इसमें से बिजली निकाल लेती है । यह वह लोग कहते थे । मैंने उनसे कहा कि तुमने वाटर मिल चलते देखी है । उसमें पानी गिरता है और आटा पिसता है लेकिन क्या तुम उस पानी को नहीं पीते । तब उनको समझ में आया कि ऐसा भी हो सकता है । इस तरह की जहालत हमारे मुल्क के अन्दर है कि लोग आपकी बड़ी बड़ी स्कीमों को और बड़े बड़े कामों को नहीं समझ सकते। हमारे फादर आफ दी नेशन ने बेसिक एजूकेशन का मसला हमारे सामने रखा है । लेकिन उस पर अमल नहीं किया गया । उसकी ट्रेनिंग के लिए कोई इदारा नहीं है । सिर्फ दिल्ली में एक इदारा है जहां बेसिक टीचर्स तैयार किये जाते हैं । मैंने उसका नाम पढ़ा है । लेकिन वह ६० लड़के सीनियर क्लास में दाखिल करते हैं और २० या ३० जूनियर क्लास में दाखिल करते हैं । अगर इस रेट पर

[श्री राम दास]

दाखिला होगा और इस तरह से टीचर निकलेंगे तो क्या वे हमारी जरूरतों को पूरा कर सकेंगे । इस तालीम का तो यह उसूल है तालीम भी हासिल करो और कमाओ भी ।

अभी एक आनरेबिल मेम्बर ने कहा कि यहां पर एक कैम्प कालिज है जो चार पांच साल से चल रहा है और रिफ्यूजीज की दरख्वास्त पर यह कालिज खोला गया था ताकि उनकी तालीम में सहूलियत हो । लेकिन इसको बन्द करने की कोशिश की जा रही है । इसकी तालीम सबसे अच्छी है । यहां फीस कम है, इसका डिसिप्लिन सबसे अच्छा है । इस इदारे कीहिस्ट्री में आज तक किसी तालिबइल्म पर जुरमाना नहीं हुआ । इसकी हिस्ट्री में आज तक स्टाफ ने स्ट्राइक के लिए कोई दरख्वास्त नहीं दी और न स्ट्रीट्स के अन्दर जाकर उन्होंने डिमांस्ट्रेशन किया । मैं बतला सकता हूं कि वहां किस किस्म के लोग पढ़ते हैं । चपरासी वहां पढ़ते हैं, भंगी वहां पढ़ते हैं और मजदूर और कुली वहां जाकर तालीम हासिल करते हैं ।

6 P. M.

मैं समझता हूं कि हमारे मुल्क के अन्दर एक यही इदारा है कि जहां पर इस क़िस्म के लोग जाकर अपनी जहालत को दूर कर सकते हैं और इल्म हासिल करके अपने अन्दर इंसानियत ला सकते हैं । उसको बन्द क्यों किया जाता है । वह गवर्नमेंट से एक पैसा भी नहीं मांगता, सरकार से कोई रुपया नहीं मांगता, वह तो सिर्फ यह चाहते हैं कि हमको रिकाग्निशन दे दो और उसके लिये कहा जाता है कि दिल्ली की जो यूनिवर्सिटी है उसके लिये जो क़वायद हैं, उनके मुताबिक़ यह नहीं हो सकता । मुझ को हैरानी है कि क़वायद इंसान के लिये हैं या इंसान क़वायद के लिये है । अगर दिल्ली के क़वायद इस बात की इजाजत नहीं देते, तो इसके लिये क़वायद बनाने चाहियें, न कि कालेज को बन्द कर दिया जाय । बल्कि मैं तो कहूंगा कि आप तमाम स्टेट्स को डाइरेक्शन दे दें कि कम से कम हर एक कैप्टिल के अन्दर एक एक कालेज इस क़िस्म के हों कि जहां पर कोई कुली हो, भिखारी हो, मजदूर हो, स्वीपर्स, भंगी हों, वे सारे दिन काम करने के बाद वहां इल्म हासिल कर सकें । आप इस कालेज को बन्द करके उनके लिये इल्म का दरवाजा बन्द कर रहे हैं । क्या यह एजूकेशन मिनिस्ट्री का फ़र्ज़ है ?

लाला अचिंत राम (हिसार) : उसकी सहूलियत दी जायगी, उसमें कालेज में दाखिला होगा और स्टाफ को नहीं निकाला जायगा । एमिग्रन्ट्स और इमिग्रन्ट्स को कष्ट भी वहां होगा ।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon Member is making a speech. The other hon. Member also must conclude now—I have given him sufficient time. He has talked about the Camp College.

श्री राम दास : इसलिये बातें तो और बहुत हैं । लेकिन आपने घंटी बजा दी है । उस दिन यहां एक सवाल पूछा गया था ।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : मैंने घंटी एक बार नहीं ,दो बार घंटी बजाई । अब बन्द कीजिये ।

Mr. Chettiar.

Shri Nagappa Chettiar (Ramanathapuram): Sir, I thank you for the opportunity you have given me.....

Shri T. S. A. Chettiar (Tiruppur): rose—(*Laughter*).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is a Comedy of Errors in the discussion on Education Ministry. Shri T. S. A. Chettiar.

Shri Nambiar: The other Chettiar must be given an opportunity to speak.

Shri Venkataraman: On a point of order, Sir, once a Member has been

called and he has started his speech.... (*Laughter*). It is not a matter of laughter; I am making a serious propcsition. Once a Member has started making his speech, is it right for the Chair to stop him and ask another hon. Member to speak? There is a precedence. In the House of Commons, when Lord Birkenhead was Mr. Smith, the Speaker called Mr. Smith. There were two Smiths one Mr. F. A. Smith and another Mr. F. E. Smith. Mr. F. E. Smith was not the person thought of by the Speaker. Mr. F. E. Smith being a good speaker, he spoke. The other Mr. F. A. Smith had to keep quiet. In these circumstances, when you have called Mr. Chettiar and Mr. Chettiar has started his speech, it is not right, particularly because he is a backbencher, that he should be deprived of his opportunity to speak.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: So far as the point of order is concerned, when Mr. Smith was speaking, the other Mr. Smith kept quiet and gave him the opportunity to speak. If this Mr. Chettiar keeps quiet, I have no objection.

Shri Nagappa Chettiar: I withdraw and I am prepared to allow Shri T. S. A. Chettiar to speak.

Shri T. S. A. Chettiar: You may allow him to speak today and give me an opportunity to speak tomorrow.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I can't say that. The other Mr. Chettiar will go on.

Shri Nagappa Chettiar: On behalf of Shri T. S. A. Chettiar, I withdraw, Sir.

Shri T. S. A. Chettiar: As I said, Shri Nagappa Chettiar may be allowed to speak....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: What is this? I thought the hon. Member who started his speech, was under the impression that he was called and that he wanted to continue his speech. Shri Venkataraman said so.

And this Chettiar also, as the other Smith in the House of Commons, kept quiet, and said: "You can go on". Now, it is not an affair between them. Mr. Nagappa Chettiar.

Shri Nagappa Chettiar: I thank you, Sir, for the opportunity given to me to speak on this Demand. I support this Demand.

I will deal with only one item, *i.e.*, Hindi. The Constitution provides that Hindi should become the official language after 15 years. People in the South feel agitated over this. They fear that even after the lapse of this period, they may not be able to keep pace with the people in North India whose mother tongue is either Hindi or a language closely allied to it. Therefore, I once again request the Government not to press Hindi.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There are ten more minutes in which this Chettiar may conclude!

Shri T. S. A. Chettiar: Many of us are sorry that this language policy has reduced itself to Hindi-Urdu quarrel. The determination of national language is not done by people who have a narrow point of view but has to be planned with a large vision. This *Rashtra Bhasha* has two enemies: one is those who oppose it, just as the few friends in South India; the other is the narrow-minded enthusiasts who want to press their language on others. I am afraid the few people who partook in this debate today belong to the second category, and they do more harm to this language than good.

I must also deplore the rather very ungentlemanly terms that were used against the people who are serving in this Department. I know some of them. They are as good, as patriotic as anybody else, and some of them have taken part in the freedom movement. Because they do not share our views, to use certain words and appellations against them is not what we should tolerate in this House.

Now, coming to certain points which were raised, I was amazed when

[Shri T. S. A. Chettiar]

I heard that there are no international scientific terminologies. The conference of Education Ministers and Vice-Chancellors unanimously declared that for helping the evolution of a common language in this country we should adopt those international terms in all our Indian languages so that not only in Hindi, but in Tamil and in every other language we can have all these basic words which will be common to us all. As one of those who are in charge of making an encyclopaedia in Tamil at a cost of nearly Rs. 10 lakhs, I know what difficulty there is in inventing fresh words for highly scientific thoughts which have never been thought in our own language. Tamil is an ancient language, we are proud of it, but to our cost we know that there are certain modern thoughts in science which have not been thought in Tamil, which have not been used, which have not been expressed in Tamil. Let us not go about coining half these words and be quarrelling with others over thesis. Let us take the international words and adapt them to the genius of our language. That is the way in which languages have grown. Those who have read the history of languages will know that when people have forced one language on others, dire consequences have followed, and the latest of them is the elections in East Pakistan. So, I would advise, I would implore, I would beg of you that in this matter of the national language let us persuade people and even go slow because persuasion pays ultimately. Not only that. I want that Hindi, if it is to be a national language, should absorb into itself many of the words that are in Tamil, in Telugu, in Marathi, so that it can really become a national language. and it should not, simply because it is spoken by a large number of people, be forced upon other people.

I would like to say one word about the place that Hindi should have in the secondary education curricula. As one who was responsible for reorganisation of secondary education in the Madras State, I made Hindi the second language, Tamil or Telugu the first language according to the area concerned, and English the third language. But there is a fear among the people in South India which I must voice. While in the non-Hindi-speaking areas, they have to read three languages—Tamil or Telugu or Malayalam as the case may be, Hindi and English—in the Hindi-speaking areas, they will study only two languages, *i.e.*, their own Hindi mother tongue and English. That will give them a pre-eminence and an advantage over the rest of the country. This is not fair.

An Hon. Member: What is the alternative?

Shri T. S. A. Chettiar: The alternative is that the Hindi-speaking people must also learn one other Indian language. This is not a new suggestion that I am making. It has been accepted by the Acharya Narendra Dev Committee in their report. This question of *rashtrabhasha* should be approached with vision, and not with narrow-minded ideas. This is the only way in which this matter of the national language can be solved. I believe that the stand taken by the Education Ministry in this matter is perfectly correct, *viz.* that international words and phrases and technical terms should be adapted into our own languages. That is a perfectly correct procedure.

Let me now come to another more important matter. We are crying hoarse here for more money being allotted to the Education Ministry. But what have we found? A lot of the money that has been allotted has not been spent. This is what the hon. Finance Minister said the other day. I have got the extracts from his speech, but I do not want to take up the time of the House by reading them now. I was very unhappy to find that a sum of nearly Rs. 2 crores which was allotted to the Education Ministry was not utilised. Now we find a certain shaking of head in certain parts of the House contradicting this. When the Finance Minister makes a

statement, we believe it is correct, and that the information has been received from the Department. If the Department has any other information to give, which is contradictory to the statement of the Finance Minister, it is for them to supply it to us. I hope we shall get something on this matter.

We are now in the Plan period, and the report of every Ministry shows how far they have been able to realise the targets of the Plan. The Plan has given certain priorities and targets for every Ministry. The Education Ministry also has been given certain targets and priorities. But it is unfortunate that the reports that have been circulated to us, excellent and nice though they are in many respects, do not throw any light on this aspect of the problem. The mere fact that large sums of money are being spent on education is no proof that there has been sufficient expansion. I know this as one who was in charge of education in my State. I spent Rs. 1 crore by way of revision of salaries, but that did not mean that one boy more was educated, or one girl more was educated, or one elementary school more was opened. What is given in these reports is just that certain sums of money have been allotted, and they are spent. We do not even know whether they have been spent fully or not. There are no indications whether these moneys have been spent usefully, whether quantitative results have been obtained, or even qualitative results have been obtained. This is not the way that a report should be supplied to us. I expect that at least in future—I would expect even before this session concludes—that the Education Ministry will circulate to us the targets that have been set up for them under the Five Year Plan, and how far they have been able to realise those targets. I can read out the targets given under the Plan, they are all given very clearly, but I shall not take the time of the House by reading them. The reports circulated to us are good, and nice indeed, but they do not give us any idea of the national progress that has been achieved in this regard.

To avoid unemployment, a new scheme has been devised, under which raw graduates who have had no training in education have been employed to teach in schools. To my opinion, nothing more tragic could have been done. People who did not want to become teachers, and who had no training for teaching, have been set on children. This may be a means of solving the problem of unemployment, but it is certainly not education. I was surprised how the Education Ministry could set its seal of approval to this scheme. Education is a specialised subject, and teaching children requires an aptitude, knowledge, training and a background, which are not had by the ordinary graduates. I would like to know the results of this experiment. I want to know whether this experiment of employing raw graduates as teachers has been good, and whether the schools run by them are being run properly, and the students are getting proper education. If possible, I would suggest a certain amount of research to be done in this matter, and statistics collected in this regard. Knowing things as I do, with the little knowledge that I have, I would say that this experiment cannot be a success. We could have given jobs to a few people, but we would not have contributed towards education in a substantial and efficient manner.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member must conclude now.

I will call upon the hon. Minister tomorrow.

Maulana Azad: Monday.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Minister might say something.

مولانا آزاد : جناب - میں نے پوری
توجہ کے ساتھ تمام دوستوں کی تقریریں
سنیں - اب چونکہ وقت نہیں ہے -
اس لئے میں سمجھتا ہوں یہ بہتر

[مولانا آزاد]

هوگا کہ پرسوں آپ مجھے کوئشچن کے بعد وقت دیں میں کوشش کرونگا کہ بیس منٹ کے اندر اپنی تقریر ختم کر دوں -

[**Maulana Azad**: Sir, I have heard with utmost attention the speeches of my hon. friends. As there is no time left now, I think that it would be better if you give me time day after to-morrow after the question hour. I will try to finish my speech in 20 minutes time.]

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : अच्छा ठीक है ।

Shri Sinhasan Singh (Gorakhpur Distt.—South): The question-hour may be dropped on Monday, Sir.

Some Hon. Members: No, no.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Hon. Members who have tabled questions will not accept it.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: May I ask a question of you, Sir? Can those who have not given any cut motion go against the policy of the Government and take up most of the time during the debate? We want a ruling on that point. They have not moved a single cut motion and yet they have taken up the lion's share of the time.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: The difficulty lies elsewhere. The Opposition takes more time.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Why does he not have the courage to bring forward a cut motion?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let there be no cross-discussion. The hon. Lady Member has raised a point. I will answer that point. Every hon. Member is entitled to participate to throw out the demands. Every hon. Member can speak on a cut motion, by whomsoever it is moved. I have been asked to give a ruling on that point and I have given the ruling. That disposes of that matter.

RESOLUTION *RE* SALARY AND ALLOWANCES TO MEMBERS

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House will now take up the Resolution on the report of the Joint Committee on the payment of salary and allowances.

Shri Radhelal Vyas (Ujjain): I have got a point of order to raise.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let the Resolution be moved. In a vacuum there cannot be a point of order.

Dr. Suresh Chandra (Aurangabad): I want to raise a point of order.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Later on. Let the Resolution be first placed before the House.

Dr. Suresh Chandra: This point of order is in relation to the question which has been discussed before—the matter which we have been discussing before.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If that is so, there cannot be any point of order. That matter has been disposed of. The point of order must have been raised then and there. The hon. Member cannot prevent further proceedings until that point is decided. The hon. Member has missed the bus.

The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha): I beg to move:

> "That this House approves and accepts all the recommendations of the Joint Committee of the Houses of Parliament on the payment of salary and allowances to, and abbreviations for Members of Parliament, and in particular the recommendation that the rate of daily allowance should with effect from the commencement of this Session of Parliament be reduced from Rs. 40 to Rs. 35 by a voluntary cut."

Sir, ten days ago—on the 17th March—while replying to Dr. Lanka Sundaram's motion, I had promised the House to bring the Resolution on the 27th, *i.e.*, today. I have accordingly moved that Resolution.

Some Hon. Members: Good.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: The House will remember that on that occasion I had said that the Government would like to refer the resolution back to the Committee to reconsider the question of T.A. and D.A. of Members in the altered circumstances. I do confess that since the Committee made its recommendations, much water has flown down....

Several Hon. Members: Where?

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: Literally so, Sir.

It is therefore proper that the entire question should be discussed, considered and reviewed *de novo*.

Shri S. S. More (Sholapur): By a new Committee?

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: On the Order Paper, I find a multitude of amendments standing in the name of several of my hon. friends. I do not want to say anything with regard to any of those amendments on merits except that of Mr. Venkataraman, which suggests a reference of the whole question to the old Committee. That amendment, I am going to accept.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram (Visakhapatnam): The one circulated this afternoon?

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: The latest amendment which was circulated this afternoon.

An Hon. Member: What is that?

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: I will read it out to you.

The House is also aware that the Joint Committee, which was nominated by the Speaker in consultation with the Chairman of the other House, consisted of Members of all the groups in both Houses. There have been two vacancies, one of this House and another of the other. The vacancy of this House was caused by the sad demise of Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee and of the other House on account of the retirement of Mr. Amolak Chand.

Shri A. P. Sinha (Muzaffarpur East): Mr. Amolak Chand has been re-elected.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: He has not been sworn in and therefore he is *functus officio*.

Shri Radhelal Vyas: Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri also.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: He is a Minister and he does not cease to function unless six months elapse.

Through you, Sir, I would request the Speaker to fill up these vacancies, the vacancy of this House and the vacancy of the other House in consultation with the Chairman.

With all respect to our friends who have given notice of amendments, I would say that no useful purpose would be served by discussing these amendments at this stage. In my humble opinion, Sir, this matter could be better discussed informally amongst the Members of the various groups.

Shri S. S. More: Why?

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: The Committee, as I said, consists of representatives of all the groups. Ultimately, the matter will be finally decided—of course, finalised—in that Committee. The recommendations of the Committee will be incorporated in a Bill which the Government is going to bring forward, if necessary, before both Houses. I think the House will have ample opportunity to discuss the provisions of the Bill. I would, therefore, appeal to the House to accept my Resolution, of coure, with Mr. Venkataraman's amendment, which is going to be moved formally, and pass it at least *nem con*, if not unanimously. I again repeat the desire of the Government to do all that is possible to put through this legislation in both Houses during this session.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion moved:

"That this House approves and accepts all the recommendations

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

of the Joint Committee of the Houses of Parliament on the payment of salary and allowances to, and abbreviations for Members of Parliament, and in particular the recommendation that the rate of daily allowance should with effect from the commencement of this Session of Parliament be reduced from Rs. 40 to Rs. 35 by a voluntary cut."

Shri Radhelal Vyas: May I raise a point of order now, Sir?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Yes.

Shri Radhelal Vyas: In raising a point of order, I am not against the Resolution as such. But, I feel that we should not conduct our business here against the rules. My point of order is that under the Rules a Parliamentary Committee can be appointed only in two ways; either by a motion—that will be before the House—or by nomination by the Speaker. Of course, in this case, the Committee has been nominated by the Speaker. Under different rules, different provisions have been made for the appointment of these Committees. For example, if you look at rule 32 regarding Business Advisory Committee, rule 40 regarding Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions, rule 180 regarding Committee on Petitions, rule 245 regarding Committee of Privileges and rule 246 regarding Committee on Subordinate Legislation.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member is too fast for me, but what is the point he wants to make out?

Shri Radhelal Vyas: My point is simply this. There are definite rules under which the Speaker is authorised to appoint a Committee of the House and it is called a Parliamentary Committee. Now, this Committee has been appointed by the Speaker but it has not been appointed by the House as has been provided under the rules. This Committee cannot be called a Committee of the Houses. Moreover there is no provision under the rules for appointing any such Joint Committee unless it is a Joint Select Committee and then also, the concurrence of the other House is necessary. In this case, firstly, whether this can be called a Parliamentary Committee, secondly, whether a Joint Committee can be nominated by the Speaker, and thirdly, even if we adopt this Resolution and make it a Parliamentary Committee, whether we can do so without the concurrence of the other House, are the points which, I hope, you will kindly look into, and if it is not according to the rules, some suitable action must be taken. The motion may be formally moved and then we may provide that the concurrence of the other House must be obtained. These are the points that I wish to bring to your notice for consideration.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Has the hon. Minister anything to say? The hon. Minister does not think it necessary to reply to such a simple matter. Let me say.....

Shri S. S. More: We would like to have something from the hon. Minister on this point.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: This point could have been very well raised by hon. Members when the first Committee was appointed. The point was not mentioned then and so there is no validity to move this motion out of order now.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I find from the records that an announcement was made by the Speaker on the 6th June, 1952, in this House regarding the appointment of the Joint Committee on Payment of Salaries and Allowances to Members. This is what I find in the proceedings:

> "*Mr. Speaker*: I have to inform the hon. Members that I have, in consultation with the Chairman of the Council of States, appointed a Joint Committee of the Houses of Parliament consisting of..............
> ... .to con-

sider and report to Parliament—

(i) (a) Whether it is desirable to change wholly or partly the present system of the payment of daily allowances to the Members of Parliament..............................

....

* * * * *

3. The Committee is a Parliamentary Committee and shall have all the powers and privileges of a Parliamentary Committee."

Therefore, I say that silence is half consent.

Shri S. S. More: No, Sir.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Unfortunately, that is my view. The House has approved, according to me, of the appointment of this Committee.

Shri Radhelal Vyas: That was only an information given to the House. *(Interruption).*

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: So far as this matter is concerned, this was not raised at that time. Secondly, when it is referred back to the Committee, all that the hon. Member has to see is—whether the previous Committee is right or wrong—that the Members whose names were there then are hon. Members of the House now.

So far as the third point is concerned, it is for the other House to take up the matter and send its Members. If they do not do so, this Committee will function without them.

So, I do not see any point of order in this. The House will now proceed.

Shri S. S. More: Sir ....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: After I have given my ruling, I will not allow any further discussion.

Shri S. S. More: I want to raise a point of order.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There cannot be any point of order on the Chair's ruling.

Shri S. S. More: Unless you hear me, how can you say whether there is any fresh point of order or not?

58 P.S.D.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: What is the fresh point of order?

Shri S. S. More: My submission is that you were kind enough to throw out a suggestion that the hon. Minister should mention the names of the Members who were formerly members of that Committee.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No, no. The hon. Member has misunderstood me. What I said was that instead of reading out those names, they may be taken as names of the members of this Committee, because they are part of the proceedings of the House. It may be treated as a resolution asking those very persons whose names have already been read and form part of the record of this House, to be Members of this Committee to whom this matter will be referred.

Shri S. S. More: My point is this. Supposing your suggestion is accepted by the hon. Minister. It would mean that he would be reading not only the names of the Members of this House but also the names of the Members of the other House, without their consent, or without the consent of the other House. Will that be a proper procedure?

Then there is another point—whether this Committee whose names as per your suggestion he has to read—will be a fresh committee, or it will be the same committee reconstituted, because fresh directions will have to be given. Your ruling creates more confusion, as far as procedure is concerned. So, I would request you to apply your mind to the problem which we have raised and give your considered ruling.

You have also said that because no objection was raised at that time, that committee was a validly appointed committee. The Committee, as will be observed, was appointed on the 6th June 1952, according to the First Edition of the Rules of Procedure. We were then fresh to the House and had not read the rules. Our ignorance on that occasion should not be construed as our consent.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have heard this argument *in extenso*. I cannot, on any of the three points, rule out this Resolution as out of order. For one thing this matter was placed before the House on a previous occasion and the House accepted it.

Some Hon. Members: No, no.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Hon. Members may say 'No'. I say 'Yes'.

Now, when the hon. Speaker made this announcement, any hon. Member could have got up and said: "We do not agree". When I place a question before the House for its decision, if any Member so desires, I ask the House to express its opinion. So far as this Committee is concerned, hon. Members kept quiet, which was taken as their consent. There is no meaning in raising a point of order now. Not that I asked the hon. Minister for Parliamentary Affairs to set out the names. It can be construed to mean as the very names there.

A point was raised that he cannot set out the names of Members of the other House. If there is any technical objection, the other House can take up the matter and then let us see.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: So far as the members of the old Committee are concerned, they were included with their concurrence. If we have another set of new members the question of their concurrence will arise. So far as the old Committee was concerned, I think the concurrence was there.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Further this is only an Advisory Committee and unless this is implemented by a Bill there could not be any change in the old rules; they will continue. There is no point of order.

Shri Venkataraman (Tanjore): My friend, Mr. Radhelal Vyas raised the question of......(*Interruptions*).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Hon. Member may move his amendment.

Sardar A. S. Saigal (Bilaspur): The ruling has been given.

Shri Venkataraman: I will first move my amendment and then of course I can speak on any matter of relevancy and nobody can stop me from referring to some things.

I beg to move:

"That for the original Resolution, the following be substituted, namely:—

'That the Report of the Joint Committee of the Houses of Parliament on payment of salary and allowances to and abbreviations for Members of Parliament be referred back to the Committee with instructions—

(i) that in view of the abolition of the First Class on Railways, the question of T.A. admissible to Members or grant of free passes should be examined and recommendation made as to the conditions under which T.A. or free passes should be regulated; and

(ii) that in view of the further experience gained since the Report was presented, the question of salary or allowances or salary-*cum*-allowances for Members should be re-examined.'"

Dr. Rama Rao (Kakinada): Sir, I rise on a point of order.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I know the point of order.

Dr. Rama Rao: How do you know without my mentioning it?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: On what is the point of order raised? He has only read his amendment. Let him continue and let us hear what exactly he wants to put before the House.

Shri Venkataraman: Since the Report of the Committee.......

Dr. Rama Rao: He cannot proceed with his amendment if you accept my point of order.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It has not been placed before the House. He has

merely read it. Before placing it before the House I will hear the point of order and if I agree with the hon. Member then I will not place it before the House.

Shri Venkataraman: Since the Report of the Committee was presented certain new factors and new circumstances have arisen. At the time when the Joint Committee reported Members of this House were eligible for payment of T.A. at the rate of one and three-fifths first class. Since then first class travel has been abolished in several Railways recoveries have been made by the Parliament Secretariat on the ground that there exists no first class and that Members are entitled to one and three-fourths second class. This matter was not under contemplation before the Committee and, therefore, it requires re-examination.

Then there is also a feeling that the system of remuneration should be by way of a salary. If we look through the amendments there is some feeling—I might emphasise on the word 'some'. As the number of amendments which have already been tabled and which have been circulated would show, there is a large volume of opinion amongst Members here favouring remuneration by way of salary-*cum*-allowances and this matter also has got to be examined.

I thought when I submitted this amendment that we might discuss this matter in the Committee. My friend, Mr. Chatterjee knows—he is a barrister and he wears a gown at the back of which there is a pouch. The convention or the fiction is that barristers do not receive fees and the clients when they are interested put it in the pouch....

Shri N. C. Chatterjee (Hooghly): It is honorarium.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: What about you?

An Hon. Member: Is it your experience?

Shri Venkataraman: I am an advocate and my gown does not contain a pouch.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: So you take it openly?

Shri Venkataraman: The convention has a meaning. People who are doing some public service should not be looked upon as doing it for money. But the fact that they have to live has also to be taken into account. Therefore I thought when Members of Parliament have got to perform certain public duties they would not like very much to discuss what salary they should get, what daily allowance they should get, what travelling allowance they should get, and all sorts of things, on the floor of the House in the gaze of public opinion. I thought as the Leaders of Groups are represented in the Committee, the Groups will be able to take the concurrence of their respective Members and be able to come to a unanimous decision, so that it may be adopted without much of wrangling over a matter which does not do much credit or good to ourselves to discuss about.

Then there is another reason also. After all this Parliament is intended to discuss public affairs and not questions relating to ourselves. For that reason I thought the time of the House may be saved if this goes to the Committee back again so that they may look into the question and come to a decision.

My amendment has two virtues.

Shri Nambiar (Mayuram): It has *all* virtues.

Shri Venkataraman: Thank you very much. For once in my life I have got the support of my friend opposite.

The first virtue is that it will not be discussed on the floor of the House. The second is that the time of the House may not be taken up. (*Some Hon. Members*: Why not?)

The objection which my friend Shri Radhelal Vyas took is based on the new Rules of 1954. These Rules were not in existence in 1952, and unless he proves to the House that under the Rules as they existed in

[Shri Venkataraman]

1952 this motion is out of order, he cannot say it is out of order. I am submitting this to influence the opinion of the Members not to be carried away by the point of order raised.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We have disposed of that point of order. What is the point of order of Dr. Rama Rao?

Dr. Rama Rao: In the List of Amendments No. 1, Mr. Venkataraman's amendment, is not moved. My amendment is No. 13 which has been passed over, and the last unnumbered amendment which must be something like No. 30 or No. 40, he is allowed to move.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He will look into the other rule. It is open to the Chair to pick out any amendment and give it preference. There are one or two fundamental points. It is open to the House to decide. The original Resolution says that here and now the report of the Committee, which says that Rs. 40 or Rs. 35 daily allowance shall be received by Members, shall be accepted. That is one thing, accepting the original report. There are a number of amendments tabled which desire that that report should be modified saying that house allowance, this, that or the other must be given, it should be converted into a salary *plus* allowance etc. Here and now if these amendments are pressed, we have to discuss and come to a conclusion on each particular one—telephone, salary or otherwise, if salary how much, if allowance what amount, for what period and so on. These are all details into every one of which we will have to go now; that is the scheme of the amendments that have been given, that is on the footing that we are going along with these. Shri Venkataraman's amendment is a different scheme altogether. When a Bill comes up before the House, if there is a motion for referring it to select committee or for circulation, that amendment has precedence over individual amendments to any particular clause. If the motion is not accepted we then go clause by clause and discuss the whole matter. Here, therefore, this amendment will have preference over the others and I have allowed it. There is no point of order.

Shri Radhelal Vyas: Sir, I want to raise another point of order. The terms of reference as announced by the Speaker in consultation with the Chairman of the Council of States says:

> "(ii) Whether instead of cash allowance paid to the Members for travelling they should get free railway pass for travelling to Delhi and back in connection with such journeys as are undertaken on the business of Parliament and if so, on what conditions such free railway pass should be issued."

Now, this amendment widens the scope that was originally in the announcement made by the Speaker. I want to know whether this House by a Resolution, without the previous consultation with the Chairman of the Council of States, can widen the scope that was announced by the Speaker.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Their concurrence is not necessary for our reducing our salaries ourselves. This is not a Bill. So far as they are concerned, if they do not want to agree with this they may go without travelling allowance, or go on with the old allowance; that is for them to decide. Even on a Bill, hon. Members are aware, this point was raised sometime before, when the Preventive Detention Bill was being discussed. It is open to us to send such direction to the Committee to look into even such matters which are not originally referred to. Therefore, there is no point of order in this. If this point is accepted an additional reference will be made, and if it is not accepted, it will be deleted and the original will stand. Now, this amendment is the bigger one and if the House accepts this, it is not necessary to consider further amendments. I may also inform the House that under the rules for any select com-

mittee or a committee of this kind, hon. Members can be present, speak, convince and participate in the discussions; only they may not have voting.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: Is it your suggestion that this particular motion should not be discussed on its merits?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: What I say is this: there are a number of amendments tabled. Now regarding house there are two or three amendments by Mr. More, one saying that a free furnished house must be given and another saying that telephones are to be given. He also suggests that such allowance as may be consistent with the dignity of Members and to provide them comfort may be given. Of course, there is one family here, another family there, a number of children who are all studying, all these things naturally will have to be gone into on the floor of the House. The question is, therefore, whether we shall go into these details now or sit in a committee where we can look into such things. If the House is against referring this to a committee and it wants to consider it now, I have no objection; it may take some time. If it is referred to a committee all Members can sit together and decide. I am not concerned with the one or the other. All that I am concerned is in putting this before the House. If the House accepts, we will not discuss it here; it will be sent to the committee; it may come back in another form or in the same form and it is for the House to accept or reject it.

Shri S. S. More: I find that the amendment of Shri Venkataraman has been duly moved, but there are some other amendments which raise some fundamental points;—as a matter of fact, you were kind enough to refer to my amendment. What happens to such amendments? Are they supposed to be moved?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: They will also be considered.

Shri S. S. More: My submission is that all these amendments may be formally taken to be moved and in the light of these amendments, those who are desirous of expressing their views as fully and frankly as possible—because I realise the difficulty in expressing our views frankly, and particularly persons who have very large families......

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I appreciate the hon. Member very well.

Shri S. S. More: I know, Sir. Therefore, my submission is that you will be kind enough to allow us an opportunity to have our say. Of course, some Members said, and Mr. Venkataraman said, that this matter be not discussed. As a matter of fact, when we have discussed the salaries of Ministers, when we have discussed your salary and the salary of the Speaker, very bluntly too, there is no reason why we should not discuss our own salary.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: What I understood Shri Venkataraman and the hon. Minister for Parliamentary Affairs to say was that it goes into such details. There are so many things here. Nowadays, on account of increased work, we have to sit here nearly for 8 months. (*Some Hon. Members*: Six months.) Six to eight months. There are a number of points which have to be considered. Alternatives have to be suggested. If it would satisfy hon. Members, I will treat all these amendments as moved and then this may be referred to the Committee. I am only making a suggestion. There, all hon. Members can sit together and evolve a solution. If still they do not agree, this House is always there.

Shri S. S. More: Why there. Why not here?

Shri Sarangadhar Das (Dhenkanal-West Cuttack): We want to discuss this matter here.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Basirhat): Every point mentioned in these various amendments has been

[Shrimati Renu Chakravartty]

thoroughly thrashed out by the Committee. Nothing new has come up except the first class affair, that has been abolished and now the second class is there. I do not know what this wonderful new thing is. If we go on like this, we can again say that we do not want to go into all the details, and so refer it back. There will be so many Committees. So many new amendments will come in again.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I find there is the amendment of Dr. Rama Rao. He has suggested a salary of Rs. 300 plus an allowance of Rs. 10 per day. That is a different scheme: not merely allowance, but salary and allowance. The point is whether that should be discussed here. In view of what has been stated here, I shall allow discussion only as to whether it ought to be referred back or not. After this is disposed of, I will take amendment after amendment and will go on giving opportunity to hon. Members, if they want to oppose. Now, I will place Shri Venkataraman's amendment before the House and allow opportunity to the hon. Members to speak on this point as to whether it is to be referred back or disposed of here and now. If it is to be disposed of here and now, if that is the vote of the House, I will go on with amendment after amendment.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: There is another thing. Before you place the amendment before the House, may I suggest a verbal amendment to Mr. Venkataraman's amendment? I suggest that the words "in the light of the amendments on the Order Paper, and the proceedings of the Committee be notified to the House and the Members be allowed to be present" may be added.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The Members of the House can be present even under the rules.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: Then, these words "in the light of the amendments on the Order Paper" may be added at the end.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He wants to add 'in view of the amendments on the Order Paper'. All right; that will come at the end.

Shri S. S. More: If you are going to give your ruling now....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member is stating something and I am trying to write it out here. I know I cannot give any final decision unless I take the opinion of the hon. Members.

The Minister of Law and Minority Affairs (Shri Biswas): May I make a humble suggestion, Sir? I suggest that the amendment be that the matter be referred back to the Committee. Don't say, having regard, etc. The whole matter will be before the Committee and the Committee will be in a position to take notice of all the amendments and other matters too not covered by any of the amendments. If the reference back is in very general terms, that would satisfy and ought to satisfy the whole House.

Dr. Rama Rao: Will you allow me to move my amendment?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am not allowing any amendment.

Several Hon. Members *rose*—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Hon. Members have not understood what I have said. The first point is whether this is to be referred back to the Committee or not. If this is decided by the House one way or the other, if this is disallowed, then we will go to the other amendments. There is Dr. Rama Rao's amendment.

Shri S. S. More: Is it not our right to discuss even the motion that you are now suggesting, the motion whether this matter is to be referred back to the Committee or not?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am placing this motion before the House. I will allow a limited discussion on the matter. Now, this amendment of Mr. Venkataraman, together with the

small modification as suggested by Dr. Lanka Sundaram and incorporated by me is now before the House.

Some Hon. Members *rose*—

Dr. Rama Rao: I oppose it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I know all of them are opposing it. I will call them one after another to state their reasons and convince the House. If the House is not convinced, they will have to sit down.

Shri Sarangadhar Das: Then on that I will take the vote, and if it is referred, no amendments will be moved here.

Is Mr. Venkataraman agreeable to Dr. Lanka Sundaram's amendment, *viz.*, to add the words "in the light of the amendments on the Order Paper" at the end?

Shri Venkataraman: Yes, Sir.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We will put this suggestion somewhere in the preamble, like this:

> "That the Report of the Joint Committee of the Houses of Parliament on payment of salary and allowances to and abbreviations for Members of Parliament be referred back, together with the Amendments on the Order Paper, to the Committee with instructions...."

Will this be suitable?

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: I will be satisfied with that.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion moved:

That for the original resolution, the following be substituted, namely:—

> "That the Report of the Joint Committee of the Houses of Parliament on payment of salary and allowances to and abbreviations for Members of Parliament be referred back, together with the Amendments on the Order Paper, to the Committee with instructions—
>
> (i) that in view of the abolition of the First Class on Railways, the question of T.A. admissible to members or grant of free passes should be examined and recommendation made as to the conditions under which T.A. or free passes should be regulated; and
>
> (ii) that in view of the further experience gained since the report was presented, the question of salary or allowances or salary-*cum*-allowances for members should be re-examined."

Shri Sarangadhar Das: I oppose the amendment for this reason. I am not conversant with law to go into the various points, but as a layman I say that this House is making a laughing-stock of itself before the country.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Quite right.

Shri Sarangadhar Das: I remember in the Constituent Assembly, when the allowance was brought down from Rs. 45 to Rs. 40, there was no objection from any side. It went through very smoothly, but in this case, when in 1952 the proposal came and it was referred to the Committee appointed by the Speaker, I happened to attend some of the final meetings under your Chairmanship, and I remember that every alternative was discussed. Three hundred rupees salary and Rs. 20 allowance; Rs. 400 salary and Rs. 15 allowance—all these were discussed, and finally the conclusion was that it should be Rs. 35. Now, that report comes before this House, and again, after dilly-dallying for over a year...

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao (Khammam): Two years.

Shri Sarangadhar Das: Though not two years, about a year and a half.

Shri V. G. Deshpande (Guna): One year and nine months.

Shri Sarangadhar Das: It again comes here ,and the Minister for Parliamentary Affairs brings a Resolution that this House do accept the findings of the Committee—the recommendations of the Committee, *i.e.* Rs. 35 daily allowance and travelling allowance as it was before, *i.e.*, first

[Shri Sarangadhar Das]

class, because at that time first class was not abolished.

Some Hon. Members: It was abolished.

Shri Sarangadhar Das: It was not abolished.

And now the Mover of the amendment, Mr. Venkataraman says....

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Labour leader!

Shri Sarangadhar Das: ...many things have happened. The Minister for Parliamentary Affairs says much water has flowed under the bridge.

[PANDIT THAKUR DAS BHARGAVA *in the Chair*]

I would like to know where that water is, where it has gone, because...(*Interruption*).

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: Perhaps the hon. Member is not aware that every day water is pumped out from the underground of this House!

Shri Sarangadhar Das: When first class was allowed, Members were supposed to travel by first class. When it is abolished and second class is given, we are supposed to travel by second class. Where is the difference?—because everybody who was travelling by first class is now travelling by second class, and our travelling allowance has been brought down from first to second class. In this way, we are making this House a laughing-stock before the country. I therefore oppose this amendment and I wish that it should be discussed here and we vote on this amendment. At the same time, I must say I support the motion made by the Minister for Parliamentary Affairs for which he should thank me.

7 P.M.

Dr. Rama Rao: I oppose this amendment of Mr. Venkataraman. He has been good enough to admit that the intention of referring it back to the Committee is to do things in *purdah*. We do not want the public or those people sitting here and laughing at us to know how our minds are working about our salaries and allowances. My submission is that this matter has been before us for nearly two years. We complain about inordinate delays in other Ministries and Departments, but we have not been able to settle our own pay, during the last twenty-one months. Every session, a number of amendments are tabled, and reams and reams of paper are spent on these amendments. I would suggest that this matter should be settled here and now. Let hon. Members come out with what is in their minds. Let us be plain....

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad (Purnea *cum* Santal Parganas): First be plain yourself.

Dr. Rama Rao: My proposal is Rs. 300 p.m. salary, and Rs. 10 allowance during the session, per day. (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. Let the hon. Member proceed. Other hon. Members who want to participate will have their chance later. Let the hon. Member go on now.

Dr. Rama Rao: Our representatives in the Joint Committee definitely suggested this salary of Rs. 300 p.m. and an allowance of Rs. 10 per day during the session. At that time, nobody accepted it. I am glad that the ruling party, as we understand from the newspapers—and these journalists have also an iota of truth about them—is now thinking in terms of pay, salary and allowance.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: Your friend also. (*Interruptions*).

Dr. Rama Rao: I would like to answer them, if I hear these questions properly.

Dr. S. N. Sinha (Saran East): You need not answer. (*Interruptions*).

Dr. Rama Rao: At least the principle of pay, salary, and allowance has been accepted, though not openly. Let us settle how much salary and how much allowance we must have. Of course, none of us can live on air.

We all want salaries and allowances or something to live by. But my point is that it must have some bearing and some relation to the poverty and unemployment of the people whom we have the honour to represent.

Sardar A. S. Saigal: Custodian?

Dr. Rama Rao: We are all custodians.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: Are we discussing the merits now?

The Minister of Law and Minority Affairs (Shri Biswas): May I point out one thing? While the Deputy-Speaker was in the Chair, he gave the ruling that he would limit the present discussion only to the question whether there should be a reference back to the Committee or not.

Shri S. S. More: Does that mean....

Shri Biswas: If the motion is lost, he would allow full discussion on the merits of the proposal. (*Interruptions*).

Shri S. S. More: On a point of order....

Mr. Chairman: I do not want to hear this point of order.

Shri S. S. More: May I seek a clarification from you?

Mr. Chairman: It is quite clear.

Shri S. S. More: It is not clear to me. I am saying that.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. Will the hon. Member kindly hear me? I did not take objection, because I know that when he is just opposing the amendment, he is entitled to say all this. (*Interruptions*).

Dr. Rama Rao: Let us be straightforward. Let us come out with what we want. Of course, it is true that Delhi is costly, and we want a certain amount of allowance on which we could live. My point is, as I have already stated, that it must have some relation to the people outside, whom all of us represent. Instead of postponing things for another year or so, and having things in *purdah*, let us put things before the House, and get them passed; and let us finish this matter once and for all. We blame others for not taking decisions in time, for keeping papers pending for months and months, and yet we keep things waiting for nearly two years.

I would appeal to all hon. Members, particularly the Congress Members, who, of course, will finally decide the issue, that we should maintain a certain standard and set an example to others. We want economy and moderation in respect of highly paid officers. When it concerns ourselves, let us be a little moderate.

There must be a modicum of moderation, if not sacrifice. I would repeat again that we can live on a very small wage. The suggestion which I have made and which my party has been making from the beginning is that there should be a salary of Rs. 300 per month with a daily allowance of Rs. 10 during the sessions.

Mr. Chairman: I would request the hon. Member not to go into the merits of the question. The question before the House is whether the report should be referred back to the Committee or not.

Dr. Rama Rao: I appeal to hon. Members not to refer this matter back to the Committee and then get into clash again with the Council of States and then postpone and postpone, but accept this principle. Let there be some moderation.

There is just one thing more. There is a talk of our dignity and status. Certainly, we have status and dignity because we have the honour to represent lakhs and lakhs of people. But status and dignity are not maintained by the money we spend or the salary we get. Most of us have had the good fortune of being associated with Gandhiji, leave alone older workers. He has talked....

Mr. Chairman: I am afraid the hon. Member is again going into the merits of the question.

Dr. Rama Rao: Leave alone simplicity. We must at least settle it here instead of following these dilatory tactics.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: I am sorry my hon. friend, Dr. Rama Rao, sought to suggest that the present procedure taken recourse to by the Government Benches is to indulge in dilatory tactics. I wish I could agree with him, but I cannot.

There are two specific undertakings given by the hon. Minister of Parliamentary Affairs. On the 17th of this month, he said:

> "It will be the earnest endeavour on the part of Government to see that that legislation is put through in both Houses before we disperse for the next session."

Then, today he has related it. The House will recall that I raised this on the adjournment motion and moved sometime back, and also on the 17th of this month when I raised this point, in reply Mr. Satya Narayan Sinha made his statement. Now, if I were convinced that there was any intention of Government indulging in dilatory tactics, I would not have suggested my verbal amendment. Nothing is lost now. It is only a recommittal to the same Committee. That is the point at issue.

As regards the merits of the question, I would like to say very little because your ruling is clear—we cannot go into the merits. But I would like to quote what Shri Sundarayya and Shri A. K. Gopalan, leaders of the Communist Groups in both Houses, have said in their Note of Dissent to the Joint Committee's report. This is at page 11.

> "People's representatives are to be paid emoluments which make them free from other pre-occupations and devote themselves completely to looking after people's needs."

Then at another place they have said:

> "Instead of accepting this healthy basis of emoluments for people's representatives, to bring forward the argument that Council of States members can pursue their gainful occupations for their livelihood because they are interrupted in their occupations only for a period of 4 months comes close to the arguments of wealthy men who want to dominate the whole show and to eliminate have-nots."

I have only to make this request to the Committee, in case this amendment is accepted by the House. Remember, it is not the dignity of the Members of the House which is at stake; it is the utter economic impossibility to carry on our duties as Members of this hon. House, maintaining two establishments with the allowance made available to us. That is the only point I would like to make, and if this amendment is accepted, I am sure I will have an opportunity to examine it in Committee.

Pandit S. C. Mishra (Monghyr North-East): Members of the Opposition, Sir, are certainly in an advantageous position at least for once, because we can take it that if we threaten to break one nose, then perhaps the Congress will lose four noses! That may be one mentality. If I threaten to cut my leg, then perhaps 350 legs on that side will be cut! Therefore, we are certainly in an advantageous position on that point. (*Interruptions*). I will also say that there are representatives of the poor—I may be a representative of the poor—with the backing of the purse of America or the backing of the purse of Russia or with the backing of the moneyed people of India.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

So there are different kinds of people in this House who represent the poor people.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We are on the simple point whether this should be referred back to the Committee or not.

Shri Nambiar: I want to know how a person representing here the Indian

people can have the backing of the American purse or the Russian purse. This is not the first time that we are hearing such things; we are hearing it again and again.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: All that Mr. Nambiar says is that a reference to the Russian purse or the American purse is absolutely irrelevant. Now, this is a simple point whether the amendments and other things necessitate its sending back to the Committee and whether it will be useful or not. That has already been considered; or, whether we must dispose it of one way or the other here. Surely, each Member may take two minutes and then finish it off.

Pandit S. C. Mishra: The question of the backing of the purse comes like this. Before becoming Members of Parliament we went to the polls and at that time all this came in.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: All this is irrelevant. It is wrong. There is no meaning in going into what all we did or we were expected to do or are going to do. The only question is the salary and travelling allowance of Members.

Pandit S. C. Mishra: Therefore, my request to the Minister for Parliamentary Affairs and other people is that they should not make a humbug of this.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. It is unparliamentary.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: What does he want to say? Should it go back to the Select Committee or not?

Pandit S. C. Mishra: My request is that they should make up their minds and decide quickly and thrash it out here.

श्री बी० जी० देशपांडे : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं इस प्रस्ताव को उस समिति के पास फिर से भेजने का तीव्र विरोध करता हूं। मेरे इस विरोध का पहला कारण तो यह है कि एक ऐसी कमेटी ने जिसमें इस सदन के बड़े योग्य और सम्माननीय नेता शामिल थे और उन्होंने दोनों सदन के सदस्यों की इस सम्बन्ध में सलाह लेने के पश्चात् उनका मत जान लेने के पश्चात् यह प्रतिवेदन तैयार किया और वह सदन के सामने एक साल से पेश है और मैं समझता हूं कि यह हमारा कहना कि हम यह प्रतिवेदन देखना नहीं चाहते हैं, कुछ इस तरह की बात करना मेरी समझ में इस समिति का अपमान करना है और उसकी अवहेलना करना है। इसके अतिरिक्त हम इसे सदन के सामने इसलिये ले जाना चाहते हैं, क्योंकि हम पर्दे में विश्वास नहीं करते हैं और इसलिये मैं नहीं चाहता कि यह चीज़ पर्दे में रख कर की जाय। यह कहा गया है कि इस सम्बन्ध में बहुत सी बातें हैं जो पत्रों में नहीं जानी चाहियें, उनकी चर्चा नहीं होनी चाहिये। मेरी समझ में इसमें कोई ऐसी बात नहीं है। हम अगर अपने लिये तनख्वाह ज्यादा लेना चाहते हैं तो इसमें छिपाने की क्या बात है, हम आकर खुल्लम-खुल्ला कह सकते हैं कि हम इतनी तनख्वाह लेना चाहते हैं। हम देश के बड़े से बड़े नेताओं को किसी को २७ हजार देते हैं किसी को ६० हजार देते हैं और किसी को ७२ हजार रुपया देते हैं, तो इससे उनके प्रति हमारे आदर की भावना कम नहीं होती है, तो अगर ग़रीब बेचारे संसद् के सदस्य को हम ज्यादा तनख्वाह देने की बात कहते हैं तो इससे हमारे भवन की या हमारे लोगों की प्रतिष्ठा देश में कुछ कम हो जायगी, ऐसा मैं नहीं मानता हूं। जहां तक मेरा सम्बन्ध है, मैं स्वयं यह तनख्वाह बढ़ाने के पक्ष में नहीं हूं। यहां पर प्रश्न यह नहीं है कि मैं बढ़ाना चाहता हूं या कम करना चाहता हूं, प्रश्न इतना ही है कि यह प्रतिवेदन आने के पश्चात् ऐसी कोई बात नहीं हुई है और हमारे जो पार्लियामेंटरी अफ़ेयर्स के मंत्री हैं उनके द्वारा या हम लोगों के द्वारा इस प्रतिवेदन को फेंक देना उचित न होगा और ऐसा करके हम ग़लती करेंगे। मैं जानता हूं कि यह बात क्यों हो रही है, इसमें उनका उद्देश्य

[श्री वी॰ जी॰ देशपांडे]

फिर से से कमेटी के पास भेजने में यह कि आपके कुछ लोग तनख्वाह बढ़वाना चाहते हैं और फिर से इसे कमेटी में भेज कर अपना मक़सद हासिल करना चाहते हैं और साथ ही जनता के सामने यह कह सकें कि इसके लिये ए॰ के॰ गोपालन भी कहते हैं और हम लोग भी कहते हैं, असल में इसको समिति के पास फिर से भेजने में यही चीज काम कर रही है। मैंने तो जैसे पहले कहा मैं इसमें कोई छिपाव नहीं करना चाहता हूं। मैं तो कहता हूं कि सरकार इस सम्बन्ध में ज़िम्मेदारी से अपनी सिफ़ारिशें रक्खे और उनके अनुसार इस सदन के सामने बिल ले आये, अब यह सदन उसका समर्थन भी कर सकता है और उसका विरोध भी कर सकता है। आपका इसको फिर समिति के पास भेजना इस मंशा से कि वहां जाकर तनख्वाह बढ़वा सकें लेकिन सदन के सामने इसको छिपाना इतने बड़े लोगों के लिये इस प्रकार की नीति शोभा नहीं देती है। इसलिये यह प्रतिवेदन समिति के पास न भेजा जाय, यह मेरी प्रार्थना है।

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: With all respect, I must say that I have not been able to follow some of the hon. Members' criticisms on the Resolution. Some of them are absolutely beside the mark and unnecessarily they have been rattling their sabres in the air. So far as the Government's intentions are concerned, some of my friends charged us of doing things sometimes behind the *purdah*. We are not used to do that and others may believe in doing things behind the *purdah* or underground. I tell you here and now that it is open to the Government to bring a legislation on the point independently of this Committee.

Shri S. S. More: Why did the Government not do so?

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: We only gave an opportunity to the Members of the House as we wanted to ascertain their opinions before bringing a legislation. It is not necessary on the part of the Government to bring in legislation incorporating anything that the Committee suggests. It is open to the Government, even after the Committee's suggestions, to bring in another legislation altogether, and when that legislation is before the House, Members will have ample opportunities to move that the whole thing should be referred to a Select Committee or to oppose any of the provisions.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Minister wants to have the greatest amount of concurrence on this matter.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: There is no Party question in this matter. So far as the Government is concerned, I should like to say that there is nothing in the mind of the Government now either to increase or decrease the daily allowance. If the Members want that it should be reduced to Rs. 20 or Rs. 15 or that it should be increased to Rs. 50, Government has no objection. I want to make it perfectly clear that Government has no intention whatsoever in this matter and if hon. Members ascribe motives to us, it is most unfair. Government's mind is absolutely open in this matter. If the majority of the Members want the *status quo* to continue, we have nothing to say against it. As has been explained, the reason for our suggestion to refer the matter back to the Committee is the abolition of first class on some of the Railways and that matter is being referred to the Committee. Naturally, that question will be reviewed by the Committee. The Members are indulging in dilatory methods because they think that Government is anxious over this matter.

Shri S. S. More: Not the Members.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: But I may say that Government will try to bring in a legislation on this question in this Session as soon as possible.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is......

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: I would like to ask the hon. Minister....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. It is too late now. I am putting Shri Venkataraman's amendment to vote.

The question is:

"That for the original resolution, the following be substituted, namely:—

'That the Report of the Joint Committee of the Houses of Parliament on payment of salary and allowances to and abbreviations for Members of Parliament be referred back, together with the amendments on the Order Paper, to the Committee with instructions—

(i) that in view of the abolition of the first class on Railways, the question of T.A. admissible to Members or grant of free passes should be examined and recommendation made as to the conditions under which T.A. or free passes should be regulated; and

(ii) that in view of the further experience gained since the report was presented, the question of salary or allowances or salary-*cum*-allowances for Members should be re-examined'."

The motion was adopted.

The House then adjourned till Two of the Clock on Monday, the 29th March, 1954.